revolving pension plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

650. Also, petition signed by 190 citizens of Linn County, Oreg., urging enactment of the Townsend old-age revolving pension plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

651. Also, petition signed by 153 citizens of Linn County, Oreg., urging enactment of the Townsend old-age revolving pension plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

652. Also, petition signed by 242 citizens of Linn County, Oreg., urging enactment of the Townsend old-age revolving pension plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

653. Also, petition signed by Fritz Abendroth and 70 other citizens of Hillsboro, Oreg., urging enactment of the Townsend old-age revolving pension plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

654. Also, petition signed by 90 citizens of Linn County, Oreg., urging enactment of the Townsend old-age revolving pension plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

655. Also, petition signed by 29 members of the Salem Chapter of American War Mothers, Salem, Oreg., urging enactment of the Townsend old-age revolving pension plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

656. Also, petition signed by 500 citizens of Linn and Marion Counties, Oreg., urging enactment of the Townsend old-age revolving pension plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

657. Also, petition signed by 241 citizens of Linn County, Oreg., urging enactment of the Townsend old-age revolving pension plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

658. Also, petition signed by 500 citizens of Linn County, Oreg., urging enactment of the Townsend old-age revolving pension plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

659. By Mr. PARKS: Petition concerning old-age pensions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

660. By Mr. PFEIFER: Petition of the Assembly of the State of New York, Albany, urging the enactment of legislation abolishing the Federal gasoline sales tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

661. Also, petition of the Assembly of the State of New York, Albany, favoring enactment of the Costigan antilynching bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

662. Also, petition of Inland Water Petroleum Carriers Association, New York City, urging support of Senate bill 204, providing for the construction of four ice-breaking vessels for the Coast Guard; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

663. Also, petition of Building Contractors Employers Association, Inc., New York City, recommending adoption of an amendment to House Joint Resolution 117, limiting the powers conferred to any governmental agency in the execution of projects contemplated in this joint resolution; to the Committee on Appropriations.

664. Also, petition of the New York County Chapter of the New York State Society of Professional Engineers, urging the administration to assign all construction design to the established private professional organizations in the execution of the four billion Public Works program; to the Committee on Appropriations.

665. By Mr. RUDD: Petition of the Assembly, State Legislature of the State of New York, regarding antilynching legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

666. Also, petition of the Pittsburgh Central Labor Union, Pittsburgh, Pa., concerning the restoration of the 5-percent salary reduction as of January 1, 1935; to the Committee on Appropriations.

667. Also, petition of the Assembly, Legislature of the State of New York, regarding taxation of sales of gasoline; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

668. Also, petition of the Ladies' Auxiliary, United National Association of Post Office Clerks, Branch No. 2, Brooklyn, N. Y., with reference to the salary restoration of 5 percent as of January 1, 1935; to the Committee on Appropriations.

669. By Mr. THOMASON: Petition of citizens of El Paso County, Tex., urging repeal of excise tax of $1,000 on all persons engaged in the sale of liquor in States where such sale is prohibited by State law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

670. By Mr. TRUAX: Petition of Cecil Bibbs and 30 other citizens of Toledo, Ohio, urging and demanding that the Congress of the United States enact into law the old-age-pension bill as sponsored by Dr. J. E. Pope, as embodied in House bill 2856, introduced by Representative WILL ROGERS, of Oklahoma, embracing the following: A Federal pension of $30 to $50 per month to every man and woman above the age of 55, financed on a contributory basis, or a tax on the earnings of persons between the ages of 21 and 45; same to be free from State and local administration or interference; to be a Nation-wide, impartial, and uniform system of old-age pensions; to the Committee on Labor.

671. Also, petition of the Order of Benefit Association of Railway Employees, Cincinnati Division, No. 137, consisting of 635 railway employees, exclusive of their families, requesting the Honorable CHARLES V. TRUAX, Member of Congress from the State of Ohio, to support to the fullest extent enactment of legislation to modify the fourth section of the Interstate Commerce Act to regulate commerce, so as to permit the railroads to compete with unregulated forms of transportation as recommended by the Federal Coordinator and covered in the Pettengill bill (H. R. 8100) introduced at the last session of Congress; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

672. Also, petition of the Mansfield Liederkranz, a singing society, consisting of over 500 members, striving for culture vocally, mentally, and physically, seeing the great suffering and privation in their city and all over this country, due to low wages and unemployment, and whereas this condition can be eliminated only through a bill providing for the establishment of unemployment, old-age, and social insurance, such as House bill 2827, introduced by Mr. LUNDEEN in the House of Representatives, hereby resolve that Congress actively support and enact into law House bill 2827; to the Committee on Labor.

673. Also, petition of the Salem Township Farmers' Institute, by their committee, composed of Altha Morgan, Ivy Hines, and Henry Swisher, urging lower rates for electric current, electrification of rural areas; restoring right to Congress to coin money and regulate the value thereof; passage of Frazier-Lemke refinancing bill, cost of production plus a reasonable profit to the farmer; opposing large appropriations for war; condemning manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors, etc.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

674. By Mr. WEAVER: Petition of various citizens of the Eleventh Congressional District of North Carolina, asking for the passage of the Townsend old-age-pension bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

675. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Taxpayers Protective League and the Municipal Manager League, of Newark, N. J.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 1, 1935

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Almighty God, Thou who fillest the heavens and earth with glory, we thank Thee for life with its privileges, hopes, and aspirations. Give us the impelling urge to move onward to the stature of the best manhood. Heavenly Father, enable us to realize most deeply the great trust which has been reposed in us. Each day keep us close to Thee and make us conscious of Thy presence. We pray, blessed Lord, that with honest hearts and clear perceptions we may deal justly, love mercy, and walk humbly with Thee. Endue us with new purpose and power, light and grace, and lift us into the largest and noblest life. We rejoice that the temple of our dreams is not among the dead, but in Him who will keep the unity of the world from being shattered and transform the moral thought and life of the man. Amen.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Horne, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 932. An act authorizing the Postmaster General to extend certain air mail contracts for a further period not exceeding 6 months;

S. 1068. An act to establish a commission for the settlement of the special claims comprehended within the terms of the convention between the United States of America and the United Mexican States concluded April 24, 1934; and

S. 1226. An act to prohibit the sending of unsolicited merchandise through the mails.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I desire to submit a unanimous-consent request. On yesterday an order was entered that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. SANDERS] may address the House for 20 minutes on a matter of national importance in Louisiana.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that following the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. SANDERS] I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes on the other side of the question, if there be one. [Applause.]

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

There was no objection.

JOHN M'DUFFIE

Mr. DUFFEY of Ohio. 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 Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. DUFFEY of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, in the Senate proceedings set forth in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for Thursday, January 31, 1935, my attention is called to an Executive nomination appearing on page 1357, and which reads as follows:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

JOHN MCDUFFIE, of Alabama, to be United States district judge, southern district of Alabama, to succeed Robert T. Ervin, retired.

Hon. JOHN MCDUFFIE, of Monroeville, Ala., was born September 25, 1883, in Monroeville County, Ala. He attended the Southern University, Greensboro, Ala.; graduated at Auburn, Ala., in 1904, and at the University of Alabama Law School, 1908; he was a member of the Alabama Legislature, 1907–11; and solicitor first judicial circuit of Alabama, 1911–19; he was elected to the Sixty-sixth and succeeding Congresses.

It was my privilege to know Hon. JOHN MCDUFFIE at the beginning of the special session of the Seventy-third Congress. I learned to know him well, and to highly respect him for his manly characteristics of honesty and integrity. Many of the Members of this Congress, who have known him longer and more intimately than I, attest to his loyal service to his country; to his faithful adherence to great fundamental principles on which our Government rests; an indefatigable worker, genuine sincerity, a congenial disposition, and the most pleasing personality have endeared him to all who have had the pleasure and opportunity of knowing him. Honored by many of his colleagues in the laudable ambition to be the Speaker of the House of the Seventy-third Congress, he received the warm, enthusiastic support of his personal friends and colleagues.

When he leaves this Congress, perhaps never to return again, he is elevated to the Federal bench in his home State, a position of honor and trust which we his colleagues know that he will fill with great honor and distinction. We regret the loss that comes to this Congress by his departure, but we congratulate him in the privilege and honor which has been bestowed on him by his Government, that he loves and reveres so much. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article published in the New York Times, by Arthur Krock, for Friday, February 1, 1935, in part, as follows:

The retirement from Congress of Representative MCDUFFIE, of Alabama, to become Federal judge in the Mobile district merits more than passing mention. His congressional career has in many respects been remarkable, and yet it has, in an important sense, been unsuccessful. From a national aspect there has been no legislator more valuable or courageous. Yet there are several Members of the House better known to the country than he.

Mr. MCDUFFIE is Chairman of the Committee on Insular Affairs, and he was party whip in the Seventy-second House. These are the highest organization positions he has held. He was never majority leader because he had an able colleague in the Alabama delegation, WILLIAM B. BANKHEAD, who was his lifelong friend. He missed the Speakership because John N. Garner, his long-time friend, answered a question from John F. Curry in one way instead of in another. With these interesting, if unsatisfactory, memories, Mr. MCDUFFIE now retires to the Federal bench, accompanied by hearty cheers from bonus and pension advocates, believers in the Government in industry, and foes of economy in general.

Cynics who require a public career to illustrate their belief that courage and ability make hampering equipment for an American politician may well consider that of Mr. MCDUFFIE. Philosophers may, however, counter with the reflection that after all a Federal judgeship is fair reward for good service and that Mr. MCDUFFIE has occasionally longed for its austere and otiose glories.

IS SERVING NINTH TERM

He is serving his ninth term in the House, and he has earned the release, if that is what he deems it. When the Democrats got their scanty House majority in the Seventy-second Congress and Mr. Garner became Speaker Mr. MCDUFFIE was appointed whip. He had entered the contest for floor leadership, but yielded to the Speaker's view that it was wiser to name a northern Member, Mr. Rainey, for that place. The previous spring he had acceded to the pleas of the Bankheads in Alabama to let brother John enter the lists for Senator against Tom Heflin, an effort that proved successful, and had determined to concentrate his ambitions in Congress.

During this term—Mr. Hoover was President—the economy committee was formed, and serving on it with Mr. McDuffie were Lewis Douglas and Joseph W. Byrns. No advocate of frugality in Government costs was more vigorous than the gentleman from Alabama, and, with Mr. Douglas, he evolved proposals to that end which made him many enemies in the ranks of the spenders. Mr. Douglas left the House afterward to become Director of the Budget, and later to find retirement from public life, the logical sequence of steadfast adherence to the views he and Mr. MCDUFFIE had pressed while members of the economy committee.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, in behalf of the minority, I am delighted to join in this deserved tribute to our beloved colleague the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. MCDUFFIE]. I am sure I voice the opinion of all on this side of the House when I say no one is more honored or more respected than this distinguished legislator who has served so many years with great ability and distinction. He was thoroughly honest, conscientious in his work, and possessed in the fullest measure the courage of his convictions. Above all, he was always a perfect gentleman. We are sorry we are to lose such a splendid statesman from these legislative Halls, because we can ill afford to lose a man of his great character and ability at this time; but we rejoice he is going to the judiciary, where we hope he will find contentment and happiness. We know our loss will be the gain of the judiciary, and our friend of many years takes with him the greatest respect of all. [Applause.]

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, the Alabama delegation are touched and deeply appreciate the splendid tribute paid to our beloved colleague, JOHN MCDUFFIE, by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. DUFFEY] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN]. We also appreciate the gracious

manner in which the Members of the House have received these spoken tributes, as evidenced by the spontaneous applause on both sides of the aisle.

May I say that no one holds a higher or more enduring place in the affections of the people of my State than does the gentleman to whom you have paid this well-deserved tribute today. From early youth his fine qualities of heart, of mind, and of soul have been given unreservedly to high public service. [Applause.]

COMMITTEE ON ACCOUNTS

Mr. WARREN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Accounts may sit today during the session of the House.

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

There was no objection.

ISAAC S. SCOTT

Mr. WARREN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution from the Committee on Accounts, and ask its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House to Isaac S. Scott, brother of Albert Scott, late an employee of the House of Representatives, $246 to cover funeral expenses of the said Albert Scott.

The resolution was agreed to.

HATTIE P. SHEPHERD

Mr. WARREN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a further privileged resolution from the Committee on Accounts and ask its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House to Hattie P. Shepherd, wife of John H. Shepherd, late an employee of the House, an amount equal to 6 months' compensation, and an additional amount, not exceeding $250, to defray funeral expenses of the said John H. Shepherd.

The resolution was agreed to.

DAISY M. BRUCE

Mr. WARREN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a further privileged resolution from the Committee on Accounts and ask its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House to Daisy M. Bruce, widow of David L. Bruce, late an employee of the House, an amount equal to 6 months' compensation, and an additional amount, not exceeding $250, to defray funeral expenses of the said David Bruce.

The resolution was agreed to.

TRANSFER OF FOREST RESERVATION LANDS TO THE STATE OF MISSISSIPPI

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 minutes, or so much thereof as may be necessary.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, the State of Mississippi is one of the few States in the Union that does not have a National Guard camp. During the late World War a national cantonment was established near Hattiesburg, Miss., which camp trained two divisions, the Thirty-eighth and the One hundred and first. That camp made an enviable record in the training of these divisions in the war.

The War Department and the State of Mississippi have designated this particular camp site as a desirable location for the National Guard camp of the State of Mississippi, but it so happens that the Forest Service has started to establish a C. C. C. camp there, has purchased a portion of this land, and has other portions of it under option.

The War Department, the National Guard of Mississippi, the Forest Service—in fact everyone is in accord on the fact that this is a desirable location for this camp—and this land should be transferred from the Forest Service to the State of Mississippi. I have introduced, therefore, a bill, after conferring with the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of War, the Chief of Staff, the Chief of the Forestry Division, and all other parties in interest. In fact, this bill was drawn by the Forest Service. It authorizes the conveyance of this land, or so much thereof as may be necessary for the purposes of this National Guard camp in Mississippi; and I now ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of this bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. This land is not very valuable, is it?

Mr. COLMER. It is not very valuable. The purchase price paid by the Government was about $2 an acre.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. About how many acres are involved?

Mr. COLMER. All told, approximately 4,000 acres. Part of this land is under option only.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I may say to the gentleman from Mississippi that I am in favor of his bill but am just trying to bring out, for the sake of the record, that the State will be enabled to secure the land, and I wanted to point out that it is not very valuable land, so that we are not taking any chances.

Mr. COLMER. Quite so. It is the purpose of the Forest Service to purchase other lands in this vicinity. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi for the immediate consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. R. 4983

Be it enacted, etc., That if any of the lands purchased or to be purchased by the United States under the provisions of the act approved March 1, 1911, as amended (U. S. C., title 16, secs. 513–521, inclusive; Supp. VII, title 16, secs. 513–521, inclusive), with the limits of townships 1, 2, and 3 north, ranges 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13, in Forrest and Perry Counties, State of Mississippi, are determined to be chiefly valuable and necessary for National Guard encampment and related military purposes, the Secretary of Agriculture, with the consent and approval of the National Forest Reservation Commission established by section 4 of said act of March 1, 1911, may, and he hereby is, authorized to convey full title to said lands to the State of Mississippi or the War Department of the United States: *Provided*, That there is paid into the Treasury of the United States, or made available by transfer on the books of said Treasury, sums of money equal to the full amounts expended by the Department of Agriculture for the purchase of said lands, and the money so paid into or transferred on the books of the Treasury shall be available for expenditure by the Secretary of Agriculture for the purchase of other lands under the provisions of said act of March 1, 1911, as amended.

With the following amendment:

On page 1, line 7, after the word "with", insert "in", and on line 10, after the word "for", insert the word "a."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN M'DUFFIE

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I should feel recreant to every impulse and prompting of my heart if I should refrain on this occasion from saying a word or two about my distinguished colleague and personal friend, the gentleman from Alabama, JOHN MCDUFFIE. He and I came to the Congress at the same time and have served here together.

I have had abundant opportunity to know of his sterling character, his unimpeachable integrity, and his outstanding ability. In this House he has represented consistently the best ideals of his party and has exemplified the principles and tenets of American manhood. His splendid service has been justly conspicuous and he will grace the Federal bench with talent and training which qualify him eminently for its duties. He goes from us with our confidence, our esteem, and our love. God bless him. [Applause.]

INTERCESSION BY THE UNITED STATES IN BEHALF OF OPPRESSED RACIAL OR RELIGIOUS MINORITIES—PRECEDENTS AVAILABLE IN THE CASE OF MEXICO

Mr. BOYLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from New York, Mr. CELLER, may be permitted to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the present intolerable persecution of Catholics on our own continent—in Mexico—dismays and frightens all liberty-loving and fair-minded citizens. This reversion to medieval methods and a supposedly outworn point of view forces us to the discouraging, but none the less inescapable, conclusion that we have made very little real progress since the Dark Ages. For, after all, if despite the advance of science and education we can still have outbursts typified by the present situation in Mexico, we have learned practically nothing from many years of experience. To Americans intolerance of any variety is especially obnoxious. The United States was founded essentially as a free country. Complete personal freedom in all phases of our daily lives is an integral part of the American birthright, and it is therefore with actual horror that we witness such a reversion to barbarism.

The fact that the rulers of Mexico, the National Revolutionary Party, are themselves antireligious is no concern of ours. But when these rulers attempt to stamp out and crush the religious freedom of their compatriots the entire aspect changes and we can regard such a policy as a definite threat to the security of our own freedom, not merely where religion is concerned, but personal liberty of every kind. For it is an established fact that dogmatism never remains limited to a small portion of existence; either it is overthrown completely and liberalism takes its place or it grows and strengthens its hold until it has choked liberty from every possible angle. Ten or twelve years ago the Mexican Government merely strove to handicap religion and restrain it within certain specified limits. But now, and this despite the fact that 90 percent of the population is Catholic, it seeks to stamp out religion altogether.

Where previously the number of priests was somewhat limited, we now find some States wherein only 1 priest is permitted for 100,000 worshipers, and in other places no priests whatsoever are allowed. As a result, large portions of the population are entirely without any sort of religious guidance. As has been proven by religious history in the past, such unfair and unwarranted persecution merely serves to stimulate and increase the natural ardor for religion, and as long as religious worship is placed under such difficulties, any sort of internal peace is impossible.

Furthermore, it is reported that our nationals resident in Mexico are being persecuted because of their Catholicism.

The Mexican Government justifies its actions in the usual way, namely, by blaming all the poverty and misfortunes of the populace on the Catholic Church. This identical method is being used by Hitler in Germany in his similar campaign against the Jews. In such cases the authorities in power always maintain that they are doing their utmost to protect the people from the pernicious influence which they are trying to stamp out. In Mexico the drive against religion goes farther than a mere suppression of free worship. It goes so far as to prohibit children from receiving any sort of religious education or instruction whatsoever. Thus the Government invades private domain and endeavors to dictate how children should be brought up by their parents. If allowed to continue, this can but result in a dictatorship so complete that it will invariably sooner or later invade every phase of economic and social, as well as of religious life.

Many times in the past the Government of the United States, through its representatives abroad, has interceded in behalf of an oppressed minority. From a perusal of the historical facts we find that such intercession has been occasioned in the main by persecution of the Jewish race. This is solely because the Jews have in the past as well as at the present time been the most universally persecuted people in the world. With the same alacrity, however, our Government interceded on behalf of other sects. It is interesting to note that in 1870 Secretary of State Fish interceded to protect Christian missionaries in Hawaii. In 1882 Secretary of State Frelinghuysen interceded on behalf of the American Bible Society in Russia. In the Treaty of St. Germain, September 19, 1919, our Government insisted upon stipulations guaranteeing the rights of religious minorities following the World War. And finally, President Roosevelt secured pledges from Russia—the U. S. S. R.—in 1933, guaranteeing against discriminations in respect to passport visas and religious liberties of our nationals.

The history of American intercession on behalf of oppressed racial or religious minorities is indeed worthy of minute review, particularly in the light of the resolution which I have offered, to wit, House Resolution 70, which is in the nature of a protest against the unjust and deplorable policy of the Mexican National Revolutionary Party in regard to the freedom of worship of the Catholics in Mexico. I desire to set forth this resolution and at the same time pay tribute and respect to the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, and especially to Carl L. W. Meyer, of that service, for his painstaking and thorough study which he submitted to me concerning this momentous topic. I also wish to thank the Director of the Legislative Reference Service, Herman H. B. Meyer, for his helpfulness.

PRECEDENTS

It appears to be a generally established principle that the United States demands for its own nationals abroad the enjoyment of as large privileges of religious freedom as are granted to nationals of other countries.[1]

As regards intercession by the United States in favor of nationals other than those of the United States, it has been observed that "the United States does not undertake to plead the cause of aliens within foreign lands save in cases where their religious persecution is conceived to be directly injurious to the rights of the Nation or of its citizens."[2] In this connection it may be noted that several Secretaries of State, including Secretaries Blaine, Gresham, and Hay, declared that the suppressive measures against Hebrew nationals in Russia and Rumania, forcing numerous destitute people to emigrate to the United States, were directly injurious to the interests of this country in a manner which justified its protest.[3] Instances of this nature and others in which the United States has interceded in foreign countries in behalf of oppressed racial or religious minorities follow:

PERSECUTION OF JEWS IN DAMASCUS

Mr. John Forsyth, Secretary of State of the United States in 1840,[4] having reference to a resolution[5] which had been

[1] In a letter dated Jan. 18, 1906, to Mr. Leishman, American Minister to Turkey, Mr. Elihu Root, Secretary of State of the United States, pointed out that "the President's message to the Sultan and the instructons sent by the Department to the Legation * * * should leave no doubt in the mind of the Turkish Government that the United States confidently and in common justice expects that American (religious, benevolent, and educational) institutions (in Turkey) shall be treated on an equal footing of benefit with those of other states"; Foreign Relations of the United States, 1906, II, p. 1378.

[2] Hyde, Int. Law, vol. 1, p. 382, citing in support of this view Mr. Cass, Secretary of State, to Mr. Williams, Minister to Turkey, Oct. 22, 1860, MS. Inst. Turkey, II, 27, Moore, Dig., VI, p. 333; Mr. Frelinghuysen, Secretary of State, to Mr. Gifford, Dec. 19, 1884, 153 MS. Dom. Let. 470, Moore, Dig., VI, p. 339; Mr. Day, Secretary of State, to the Reverend Mr. Strong, June 3, 1898, 229 MS. Dom. Let. 113, Moore, Dig., II, p. 178.

[3] See below; also Borchard, Diplomatic Protection of Citizens Abroad (1915 ed.), p. 466, citing President Harrison in annual message, Dec. 9, 1891, For. Rel., 1891, XII; Mr. Hay, Secretary of State, to Mr. Wilson, Minister to Rumania, July 17, 1902, For. Rel., 1902, p. 910; and Moore, Dig., VI, secs. 925 and 926. See also Hyde, op. cit., vol. 1, p. 88f.

[4] Mr. John Forsyth, Secretary of State, to Mr. J. B. Kursheedt, chairman of the executive committee of the Israelites of New York, and Mr. Theodore J. Seixas, secretary of the same committee, Aug. 26, 1840, 31 MS. Dom. Let. 203; Moore, J. B., Digest of International Law, VI, 347. The text of Secretary Forsyth's letter to Messrs. Kursheedt and Seixas is also printed in full in Jacob Ezekiel's Persecution of the Jews in 1840, a contribution to the Publications of the American Jewish Historical Society, No. 8 (Baltimore, 1900), pp. 142–3.

[5] For full text of the resolution, see Ezekiel, Jacob, op. cit., pp. 141–2.

adopted August 19, 1840, at a meeting of Hebrews held for the purpose of "uniting in an expression of sympathy for their brethren in Damascus", stated that the heart-rending scenes which had occurred[6] at that city had previously been brought to the notice of the President of the United States[7] by a communication from the American consul at that place, and that in consequence thereof "a letter of instructions was immediately written to our consul at Alexandria."[8] Mr. Forsyth further pointed out that "about the same time our chargé d'affaires at Constantinople was instructed to interpose his good offices in behalf of the oppressed and persecuted race of the Jews in the Ottoman dominions, among whose kindred are found some of the most worthy and patriotic of our own citizens, and the whole subject, which appeals so strongly to the universal sentiments of justice and humanity, was earnestly recommended to his zeal and discretion."

DISCRIMINATIONS AGAINST HEBREWS IN SWITZERLAND

The Swiss Constitution formerly permitted certain discriminations against Israelites. Some of the Swiss Cantons, in conformity with their constitutional rights, refused residence in their territory to believers in the Mosaic dispensation on the ground that the Cantons "did not desire an augmentation of the number of Jewish merchants", a refusal given to many Jews of different countries.[9] Since the discrimination also involved Jewish citizens of the United States, considerable correspondence on that subject ensued between the Governments of the United States and Switzerland.[10]

In 1850 the American Minister to Switzerland was charged with the duty of negotiating a treaty of commerce between this country and the Swiss Confederation. On February 13, 1851, President Millard Fillmore forwarded to the Senate of the United States a proposed general convention signed at Berne, the Swiss Capital, on November 25, 1850,[11] together with a copy of the instructions under which the American negotiators had acted, and a despatch of November 30, 1850, explanatory of the articles of the convention. In his message transmitting the treaty, President Fillmore expressed his objections to the last clause in article 1 of the proposed convention, which read as follows:[12]

On account of the tenor of the Federal Constitution of Switzerland, Christians alone are entitled to the enjoyment of the privileges guaranteed by the present article in the Swiss Cantons. But said Cantons are not prohibited from extending the same privileges to citizens of the United States of other religious persuasions.

The President further pointed out that "it is quite certain that neither by law, nor by treaty, nor by any other official proceeding is it competent for the Government of the United States to establish any distinction between its citizens founded on differences in religious beliefs." After considerable delay the treaty was finally ratified by the President on November 6, 1854,[13] after some of the objectionable provisions had been amended.[14] Still, the provisions in the Swiss Constitution discriminating against Hebrews were not changed at that time, and continued to occupy the attention of the President and of the State Department. On November 5, 1857, Secretary of State Lewis Cass sent the following instructions to Mr. Fay, the United States Minister to Switzerland:[15]

I am directed by the President to instruct you to use all the means in your power to effect the removal of the odious restrictions complained of, which, it is understood, are contained in the laws of but four of the Swiss Cantons. You are requested to inform the Department upon this point, and to state the names of the Cantons in which these laws exist.

Restrictive measures against the Jews were particularly marked in the Canton of Basel, where on November 17, 1851, the following law was promulgated:[16]

1. No Jew, without exception, is permitted to settle, to carry on commerce, trade, or any handicraft in the Canton.
2. Any citizen who admits a Jew into his house, be it for commercial purposes, as clerk or servant, or in any other capacity, or for what other purpose soever, is liable to a fine of 300 francs.
3. Hawking goods or with patterns, dealing in cattle, produce, leather, etc., is prohibited to any Jew, under a fine of from 5 to 20 francs for the first offense, and of confiscation of goods and of the same fine for the second offense.
4. Whoever lets a wareroom, stall, or house to any Jew, during a fair, for a period exceeding 6 days, is liable to a fine of 50 francs for the first contravention and of 200 francs for the second.

On January 18, 1858, Minister Fay's letter to Secretary Cass included the following:[17]

I shall endeavor to present the question in so clear a light as to demonstrate that a more liberal course is required by the dignity, and even by the material interest, of Switzerland herself. I hope also to procure a larger interpretation of the law in favor of our fellow citizens that some practical benefit may immediately result.

Secretary Cass, under date of April 17, 1858, dispatched the following to Mr. Fay:[18]

The President learns with pleasure that your efforts in behalf of the American Israelites in Switzerland have not been relaxed. The removal of the restrictions contained in the cantonal laws so oppressive to Jewish citizens of the United States is, as you are aware, a matter which the President has much at heart, and he indulges the hope that the measures taken by you to secure that result may be successful.

The Swiss Confederation on May 29, 1874, adopted a new federal constitution which accorded full religious liberty to all. Article 50 of this constitution provides that—

The free exercise of worship is guaranteed, within the limits compatible with public order and good morals.[19]

PROTEST AGAINST EXECUTION OF JEW BY MOHAMMEDANS

Mr. Lewis Cass, Secretary of State, in his instructions—July 29, 1857—to Mr. Chandler, Minister to the Two Sicilies, stated that the joining by an American consul in a Mohammedan country with the consuls from other nations in a protest against the conviction and execution of a Jew for blasphemy "meets with the approval of the Government of the United States."[20]

PROTECTION OF CHRISTIAN MISSIONARIES IN HAWAII

In 1870, Mr. Hamilton Fish, Secretary of State of the United States, in his instructions to the American Minister to Hawaii declared[21] that—

it is a matter of regret that the Christian missionaries of the United States and of Hawaii to the Micronesian group should have experienced any obstacle in the prosecution of their calling, and especially that they should have been wronged in their person and property by the savage aborigines. It is hoped that the vessel of war which, it is understood, has been ordered thither, will have the effect of preventing any further outrages upon our citizens.

---

[6] The facts of this case are given more fully in Dr. Cyrus Adler's book entitled "Jews in the Diplomatic Correspondence of the United States", publication of the American Jewish Historical Society, No. 15 (Baltimore, 1906), p. 4ff.

[7] President Martin Van Buren.

[8] The text of Mr. Forsyth's letter of instructions to Mr. John Gliddon, United States consul at Alexandria, is also printed in Ezekiel, Jacob, op. cit., pp. 143, 144. For text of the resolution adopted by the executive and corresponding committee of Israelites of Virginia to the effect that a letter be addressed to President Van Buren expressing the "acknowledgments of the Israelites of Virginia in common with their brethren throughout the United States and elsewhere, for the prompt and handsome manner in which he has acted in reference to the persecutions practiced upon our brethren of Damascus", and for the text of the letter to President Van Buren, dated Sept. 4, 1840, see ibid., p. 145.

[9] House of Representatives, Executive Documents, 36th Cong., 1st sess., 1859–60, Ex. Doc. No. 76, p. 4.

[10] In compliance with resolutions of the House of Representatives, the President of the United States, in a message, transmitted to Congress "information relative to discrimination in Switzerland against citizens of the United States of the Hebrew persuasion." For text of the message see Ex. Doc. No. 76 (op. cit.), pp. 1–101.

[11] See Malloy, W. M., Treaties, conventions, etc. (61st Cong., 2d sess., Sen. Doc. No. 357), vol. 2, p. 1763.

[12] See Stroock, S. M., Switzerland and American Jews, in Publications of the American Jewish Historical Society, No. 11 (Baltimore, 1903), p. 8.

[13] Malloy, op. cit., p. 1763.—The treaty was finally proclaimed Nov. 9, 1855.

[14] See Stroock, op. cit., p. 23.

[15] House Executive Document No. 78 (op. cit.), p. 12.

[16] Stroock, op. cit., p. 12.

[17] House Executive Document No. 78, p. 16.

[18] Dodd, Walter Fairleigh, Modern Constitutions, a collection of the fundamental laws of 22 of the most important countries of the world, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1909, vol. 2, p. 271.

[19] House Ex. Doc. No. 78, p. 22.

[20] Mr. Cass, Secretary of State, to Mr. Chandler, no. 12, July 29, 1857, MS. Inst. Barbary Powers, XIV, 193; Moore, Digest, VI, 348.

[21] Mr. Fish, Secretary of State, to Mr. Pierce, Minister to Hawaii, no. 13, April 6, 1870, MS. Instructions to United States Ministers, Department of State, Washington, D. C., Hawaii, II, 196; Moore, Digest, VI, 333–34.

PROTECTION OF JEWS IN MOROCCO

On July 2, 1878, Secretary of State Evarts transmitted the following to Mr. Felix A. Mathews, United States consul at Tangier: [22]

I transmit herewith a copy of a letter dated the 15th ultimo, addressed to this Department, by Mr. Meyer S. Isaacs, president, and S. Wolf, vice president of the board of delegates of American Israelites, New York, requesting that you be instructed to inquire into the condition of the Jews in that Empire, and to consult for the amelioration of their status. I also enclose a copy of the reply thereto of the Department, by which you will perceive that Mr. Isaacs has been informed that, in view of the fact that the informal friendly offices of the United States have, on similar occasions, been exercised with good results, through their representatives abroad, you would be authorized to act in the sense of his request. You are consequently requested to take such steps toward the accomplishment of the end desired as may be consistent with your international obligations and the efficiency of your official relations with the Government of Morocco.

During the same month Secretary of State Evarts wrote to the said Messrs. Isaacs and Wolf as follows: [23]

It is, as you are, of course, aware, difficult for a foreign government to make the full force of its influence felt in intervening for the protection of native subjects of the State addressed. Nevertheless, in view of the fact that the informal and friendly offices of the United States have, at times before now, been used with good effect, through the informal action of their representatives abroad in the interest of humanity, and of that full religious toleration and equity which form so conspicuous a base for our own enlightened institutions, I shall be happy to instruct the United States consul at Tangier that he is at liberty to act, in the sense of your request, so far as may be consistent with his international obligations and the efficiency of his official relations with the Scheriffian government.

JEWISH PERSECUTIONS IN RUMANIA

In 1870 Mr. Benjamin F. Peixotto, an American Hebrew, was appointed consul of the United States to Rumania for the purpose, among other things, of promoting Jewish emancipation and cessation of anti-Jewish activity in that country. President Grant, on December 8, 1870, handed Mr. Peixotto his credentials, which read in part as follows: [24]

Mr. Peixotto has undertaken the duties of his present office more as a missionary work for the benefit of the people he represents than for any benefit to accrue to himself—a work in which all citizens will wish him the greatest success. The United States, knowing no distinction of her own citizens on account of religion or nativity, naturally believes in a civilization the world over, which will secure the same universal views.

REPRESENTATIONS TO SPAIN CONCERNING THE QUESTION OF RELIGIOUS LIBERTY

In his instructions (Dec. 8, 1876) to Mr. Adee, chargé d'affaires of the United States at Madrid, Secretary of State Hamilton Fish said: [25]

Upon the 23d of November, Sir Edward Thornton called upon me and stated that he was instructed by Lord Derby to read to me, and if I desired it to leave with me a copy of an instruction bearing date October 28, which had been addressed to Mr. Layard, Her (British) Majesty's minister at Madrid, touching religious toleration in Spain, and that Lord Derby expressed the hope that the Government of the United States might instruct its representative at Madrid to make representations in a similar sense to the Government of the King. I transmit, herewith, a copy of this instruction, which was given me by Sir Edward Thorton. * * *

You are instructed to act in concert with Mr. Layard, Her Majesty's minister, in the sense in which he is instructed by Lord Derby, and to take occasion to speak in a similar sense to the minister of state, impressing upon him the deep interest which the question of religious liberty in Spain excites in the United States, and the strong hope that the steps lately taken by the Spanish Government with reference to religious freedom and toleration may not be followed by others of a more retrograde character, and that the rights which the minister of state admits are secured to Protestants by the eleventh article of the constitution may be entirely respected, and that the United States rely upon the good faith of the Spanish Government to promptly and firmly suppress any attempt from any quarter to infringe upon these rights.

INTERCESSION IN BEHALF OF THE AMERICAN BIBLE SOCIETY

On May 27, 1882, Secretary of State Frelinghuysen enclosed to the American Legation at the Russian capital a letter from the American Bible Society concerning the introduction and sale in parts of Russia of copies of the Bible printed by that society.[26] It declared that agents of the society were forbidden to sell the Scriptures from house to house in Estonia, then a part of the Russian Empire, and that copies of the Scriptures published by the society in the Armenian and Syriac languages, imported by way of Tabriz or Constantinople, were excluded from the region of the Caucasus by a Russian ministerial decree. Mr. Frelinghuysen pointed out that the American Bible Society was incorporated under the laws of New York and that—

Apart from its claims in common with other lawful American corporations to the kindly offices of the Government of the United States, there was in this case the unselfish aim of doing good, which commended it to the support of enlightened people.

Mr. Hoffman, the chargé d'affaires, was directed—

To read the instruction to the Russian Minister of Foreign Affairs and to express the hope that the Russian Government would examine into the allegations submitted, and if they were found to be well grounded issue such orders as might be deemed right and best fitted to afford the desired relief.

THE KEILEY CASE

In 1885, the fact that the Austro-Hungarian Government refused to accept the Honorable Anthony M. Keiley, who was married to a Jewess, as Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary, gave rise to considerable correspondence between the two Governments concerned.[27]

On May 4, 1885, Mr. Thomas F. Bayard, Secretary of State of the United States, wrote to Baron Schaeffer, Austro-Hungarian Minister to the United States, that "I have the honor to inform you that the President has appointed Anthony M. Keiley, of Virginia, one of our distinguished citizens, to succeed Mr. Francis as the Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States at Vienna. In communicating this intelligence, I desire to bespeak for Mr. Keiley, through your kind offices, that favorable reception at Vienna which is due to his merits as an American citizen of great ability and character."

Five days later Baron Schaeffer handed Secretary Bayard the translation of a telegram dated Vienna, May 8, 1885, from Count Kalnoky, which is given here in full:

We regret the nomination of Mr. Keiley as Minister Plenipotentiary and Envoy Extraordinary to the Imperial Court and his sudden departure from America, as here, too, like in Rome, prevail scruples against this choice.

Please direct in the most friendly way the attention of the American Government to the generally existing diplomatic practice to ask previously to any nomination of a foreign minister the agrément (consent) of the Government to which he is accredited.

You are therefore requested to earnestly entreat them that the newly nominated Minister may not reach Vienna before our confidential consent to his nomination has taken place.

The position of a foreign envoy wedded to a Jewess by civil marriage would be untenable and even impossible in Vienna.

COUNT KALNOKY.

In a note to Baron Schaeffer dated May 18, 1885, Secretary of State Bayard, after having submitted the matter to the consideration of the President, wrote in part as follows:

The supreme law of this land expressly declares that "no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States", and by the same authority it is declared that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

This is a government of laws, and all authority exercised must find its measure and warrant thereunder.

It is not within the power of the President, nor of Congress, nor of any judicial tribunal of the United States, to take or even hear testimony or in any mode to inquire into or decide upon the religious belief of any official, and the proposition to allow this to be done by any foreign government is necessarily and a fortiori inadmissible.

To suffer an infraction of this essential principle would lead to a disfranchisement of our citizens because of their religious belief, and thus impair or destroy the most important end which our

[22] U. S. Department of State, Papers Relating to the Foreign Relations of the United States, 1878, pp. 685–686.

[23] Mr. Evarts, Secretary of State, to Messrs. Isaacs and Wolf, July 1, 1878, 123 MS. Dom. Let. 395; Moore, Dig., VI, p. 349.

[24] Kohler, M. J., and Wolf, Simon, Jewish disabilities in the Balkan States, American contributions toward their removal, with particular reference to the Congress of Berlin, Publication of the American Jewish Historical Society No. 24 (Baltimore, 1916), p. 13.

[25] Mr. Fish, Secretary of State, to Mr. Adee, chargé at Madrid, Dec. 8, 1876, MS. Inst. Spain, XVIII, 52; Moore, Dig., VI, p. 175–6.

[26] Mr. Frelinghuysen, Secretary of State, to Mr. Hoffman, chargé, no. 128, May 27, 1882, MS. Inst. Russia, XVI, 279; Moore, Dig., VI, 335–336.

[27] The quotations below are taken from United States Department of State, Papers Relating to the Foreign Relations of the United States, 1885, p. 48ff. See also Moore, John B., Digest of International Law, vol. IV, p. 480ff.

Constitution of government was intended to secure. Religious liberty is the chief cornerstone of the American system of government, and provisions for its security are embedded in the written charter and interwoven in the moral fabric of its laws.

Anything that tends to invade a right so essential and sacred must be carefully guarded against, and I am satisfied that my countrymen, ever mindful of the suffering and sacrifices necessary to obtain it, will never consent to its impairment for any reason or any pretext whatsoever.

In harmony with this essential law is the most equally potential unwritten law of American society that awards respect and delicate consideration to the women of the United States and exacts deference in the treatment at home and abroad of the mothers, wives, and daughters of the Republic.

The case we are now considering is that of an envoy of the United States, unquestionably fitted, morally and intellectually, and who has been duly accredited to a friendly Government, toward which he is thoroughly well affected; who in accordance with the laws of this country has long since contracted and has maintained an honorable marriage, and whose presence near the foreign government in question is objected to by its agents on the sole ground that his wedded wife is alleged to entertain a religious faith which is held by very many of the most honored and valued citizens of the United States.

It is not believed by the President that a doctrine and practice so destructive of religious liberty and freedom of conscience, so devoid of catholicity, and so opposed to the spirit of the age in which we live can for a moment be accepted by the great family of civilized nations or be allowed to control their diplomatic intercourse.

Certain it is, it will never, in my belief, be accepted by the people of the United States nor by any administration which represents their sentiments. * * *

President Grover Cleveland, in his annual message to Congress of December 8, 1885, referring to the Keiley incident and to the position taken by the Government of Austria-Hungary, stated[28] that:

The reasons advanced (by that Government) were such as could not be acquiesced in without violation of my oath of office and the precepts of the Constitution, since they necessarily involved a limitation in favor of a foreign government upon the right of selection by the Executive, and required such an application of a religious test as a qualification for office under the United States as would have resulted in the practical disfranchisement of a large class of our citizens and the abandonment of a vital principle in our Government. The Austro-Hungarian Government finally decided not to receive Mr. Keiley as the envoy of the United States, and that gentleman has since resigned his commission, leaving the post vacant. I have made no new nomination, and the interests of this Government at Vienna are now in the care of the secretary of legation acting as chargé d'affaires ad interim.

INTERCESSION IN BEHALF OF JEWS IN RUSSIA (1891)

On August 20, 1890, the House of Representatives of the United States adopted a resolution requesting the President to communicate to that body any information in his possession with regard to the enforcement of proscriptive edicts against the Jewish people in Russia.

The President of the United States responded to the said resolution on October 1 of the same year, and accompanied his response with a report which, with reference to the rumors that new measures of repression were about to be put in force, said in part that:

Such a step, if in reality contemplated, would not only wound the universal and innate sentiment of humanity, but would suggest the difficult problem of affording an immediate asylum to a million or more of exiles without seriously deranging the conditions of labor and of social organization in other communities.[29]

Secretary of State James G. Blaine, in his instructions to Mr. Smith, American Minister to Russia,[30] under date of February 18, 1891, included the following statement:

The Government of the United States does not assume to dictate the internal policy of other nations, or to make suggestions as to what their municipal laws should be, or as to the manner in which they should be administered. Nevertheless, the mutual duties of nations require that each should use its power with due regard for the results which its exercise produces on the rest of the world. It is in this respect that the condition of the Jews in Russia is now brought to the attention of the United States, upon whose shores are cast daily evidences of the suffering and destitution wrought by the enforcement of the edicts against this unhappy people. I am persuaded that His Imperial Majesty the Emperor of Russia, and his councilors, can feel no sympathy with measures which are forced upon other nations by such deplorable consequences.

You will read this instruction to the Minister of Foreign Affairs and give him a copy if he desires it.

On April 20, 1891, Mr. Charles Emory Smith, Minister of the United States to Russia, wrote to Secretary Blaine from St. Petersburg, the Russian capital, that—

Within a few days the Russian journals have stated that 150 Jewish families of Moscow have been notified that they must remove from that city, and I am informed that 50 families of this city are about to receive a similar notification. It is probable that these are only the forerunners of further expulsions. No new law has been ordained and none has been required to this end. It is held to be simply an application of the existing law hitherto unenforced. According to the strict letter there are many thousands living here and at the ancient capital of the Empire without legal authority. The number is said to be from 10,000 to 20,000 at St. Petersburg and nearly 100,000 at Moscow. Though destitute of technical right, their residence has had the sanction of long toleration and has acquired the sacredness of an established home, the compulsory abandonment of which would be attended with hardship. It is supposed that the result will be tempered with such degree of consideration and such allowance of time for preparation as here compatible with a measure of this nature. The Government has declared that this new application of the old laws would be made "gently and gradually", and the steps now taken, with those to follow, will show how these terms are to be interpreted.[31]

The plight of the Jewish people in Russia at that time was referred to in President Harrison's message to Congress of December 9, 1891,[32] in which the President said:

This Government has found occasion to express in a friendly spirit, but with much earnestness, to the Government of the Czar, its serious concern because of the harsh measures now being enforced against the Hebrews in Russia. By the revival of anti-Semitic laws, long in abeyance, great numbers of those unfortunate people have been constrained to abandon their homes and leave the Empire by reason of the impossibility of finding subsistence within the pale to which it is sought to confine them. The immigration of these to the United States—many other countries being closed to them—is largely increasing and is likely to assume proportions which may make it difficult to find homes and employment for them here and to seriously affect the labor market. It is estimated that over 1,000,000 will be forced from Russia within a few years. The Hebrew is never a beggar; he has always kept the law—life by toil—often under severe and oppressive civil restrictions. It is also true that no race, sect, or class has more fully cared for its own than the Hebrew race. But the sudden transfer of such a multitude, under conditions that end to strip them of their small accumulations and to depress their energies and courage, is neither good for them nor for us. The banishment, whether by direct decree or by not less certain indirect methods, of so large a number of men and women is not a local question. A decree to leave one country is, in the nature of things, an order to enter another—some other. This consideration, as well as the suggestions of humanity, furnishes ample ground for the remonstrances which we have presented to Russia, while our historic friendship for that Government cannot fail to give the assurance that our representations are those of a sincere well-wisher.

SECRETARY HAY'S NOTE CONCERNING CONDITION OF JEWS IN RUMANIA (1902)

Under the personal supervision of President Theodore Roosevelt, Secretary of State John Hay prepared an extensive note concerning the disabilities of the Jewish people in Rumania, which was dispatched, on July 17, 1902, to Minister Charles S. Wilson, in charge of American interests in Rumania. This note also discussed the proposed naturalization convention between the United States and Rumania. Extracts of the same are given below:[33]

Starting from the arbitrary and convertible premise that the native Jews of Rumania domiciled there for centuries are "aliens not subject to foreign protection", the ability of the Jew to earn even the scanty means of existence that suffice for a frugal race has been constricted by degrees, until nearly every opportunity to win a livelihood is denied; and until the helpless poverty of the Jew has constrained an exodus of such proportions as to cause general concern.

The political disabilities of the Jews in Rumania, their exclusion from the public service and the learned professions, the limitations of their civil rights, and the imposition upon them of exceptional taxes, involving as they do wrongs repugnant to the moral sense of liberal modern peoples, are not so directly in point for my present purpose as the public acts which attack the inherent right of a man as a breadwinner in the ways of agriculture and trade. The Jews are prohibited from owning land,

[28] U. S. Department of State, Foreign Relations of the United States, 1885, p. IV.

[29] U. S. Department of State, Papers Relating to the Foreign Relations of the United States, 1891, p. 738. See also, Moore, Dig., vol. VI, p. 354.

[30] For. Rel., 1891, p. 739.

[31] U. S. For. Rel., 1891, pp. 742–743.

[32] President Benjamin Harrison, Annual Message, Dec. 9, 1891, U. S. For. Rel., 1891, p. XII; see also Moore, Dig., VI, p. 358–359.

[33] U. S. For. Rel., 1902, p. 912ff. See also Kohler and Wolf, Jewish disabilities in the Balkan States (op. cit.), p. 80ff.

or even from cultivating it as common laborers. They are debarred from residing in the rural districts. Many branches of petty trade and manual production are closed to them in the overcrowded cities, where they are forced to dwell and engage, against fearful odds, in the desperate struggle for existence. Even as ordinary artisans or hired laborers they may only find employment in the proportion of one "unprotected alien" to two "Rumanians" under any one employer * * *. Human beings so circumstanced have virtually no alternatives but submissive suffering or flight to some land less unfavorable to them. Removal under such conditions is not and cannot be healthy, intelligent emigration of a free and self-reliant being. It must be, in most cases, the mere transplantation of an artificially produced diseased growth to a new place * * *.

The United States offers asylum to the oppressed of all lands. But its sympathy with them in no wise impairs its just liberty and right to weigh the acts of the oppressor in the light of their effects upon this country and to judge accordingly.

Putting together the facts, now painfully brought home to this Government, during the past few years, that many of the inhabitants of Rumania are being forced by artificially adverse discriminations to quit their native country; that the hospital asylum offered by this country is almost the only refuge left to them; that they come hither unfitted by the conditions of their exile to take part in the new life of this land under circumstances either profitable to themselves or beneficial to the community, and that they are objects of charity from the outset and for a long time—the right of remonstrance against the acts of the Rumanian Government is clearly established in favor of this Government. Whether consciously and of purpose or not, these helpless people, burdened and spurned by their native land, are forced by the sovereign power of Rumania upon the charity of the United States. This Government cannot be a tacit party to such an international wrong. It is constrained to protest against the treatment to which the Jews of Rumania are subjected, not alone because it has unimpeachable ground to remonstrate against the resultant injury to itself, but in the name of humanity. The United States may not authoritatively appeal to the stipulations of the Treaty of Berlin, to which it was not and cannot become a signatory, but it does earnestly appeal to the principles consigned therein, because they are principles of international law and eternal justice, advocating the broad toleration which that solemn compact enjoins, and standing ready to lend its moral support to the fulfillment thereof by its cosignatories, for the act of Rumania itself has effectively joined the United States to them as an interested party in this regard.

Identical instructions along lines of the one just partly quoted were sent on August 11, 1902, by the Department of State to the representatives of the United States to Great Britain, Germany, France, Italy, Russia, and Turkey, to be submitted by them to the ministers of foreign affairs of the countries to which they were accredited. The two opening paragraphs of the said instructions contained the following: [34]

In the course of an instruction recently sent to the Minister accredited to the Government of Rumania in regard to the bases of a negotiation begun with that Government looking to a convention of naturalization between the United States and Rumania, certain considerations were set forth for the Minister's guidance.

It has seemed to the President appropriate that these considerations, relating, as they do, to the obligations entered into by the signatories of the Treaty of Berlin of July 13, 1878, should be brought to the attention of the Governments concerned and commended to their consideration in the hope that, if they are so fortunate as to meet the approval of the several powers, such measures as to them may seem wise may be taken to persuade the Government of Rumania to reconsider the subject of the grievances in question.

THE KISHINEV MASSACRE

During April 19–20, 1903, an anti-Semitic outbreak occurred in Kishinev, Russia, causing the death of 47 Jews and injuries to several hundreds of other people of the Jewish race.[35] In addition, great material losses were caused by this outbreak, 700 houses were destroyed, 600 stores looted, and many families utterly ruined. As a result of these outrages, a mass meeting was held in New York City at Carnegie Hall in protest against the Kishinev affair. The meeting was presided over by Paul D. Cravath, and the speakers included ex-President Cleveland, Mayor Seth Low, Jacob G. Schurman, president of Cornell University, and others.

During the said meeting a resolution was adopted, which read in part as follows:[36]

Resolved, That the people of the United States should exercise such influence with the Government of Russia as the ancient and unbroken friendship between the two nations may justify to stay the spirit of persecution, to redress the injuries inflicted upon the Jews of Kishineff, and to prevent the recurrence of outbreaks such as have amazed the civilized world.

Early in July of the same year President Theodore Roosevelt directed Secretary of State John Hay to instruct the American chargé at St. Petersburg to ask for an audience with the Russian Minister of Foreign Affairs and to make to him the following communication: [37]

EXCELLENCY: The Secretary of State instructs me to inform you that the President has received from a large number of prominent citizens of the United States of all religious affiliations, and occupying the highest positions in both public and private life, a respectful petition addressed to His Majesty the Emperor relating to the condition of the Jews in Russia and running as follows:

Here is set out the petition: [38]

I am instructed to ask whether the petition will be received by Your Excellency to be submitted to the gracious consideration of His Majesty. In that case the petition will be at once forwarded to St. Petersburg.

Subsequently the American chargé at St. Petersburg informed the State Department at Washington that—

The Russian Government, through its Minister of Foreign Affairs, had declined to receive or consider the petition.[39]

TERMINATION OF THE TREATY OF 1832 BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND RUSSIA

The treaty of commerce and navigation concluded between the United States of America and Russia on December 18, 1832, was terminated by the United States in 1911, owing in a large measure to discriminations against Jewish holders of American passports by agents of the Russian Government.

On December 11, 1911, Mr. William G. McAdoo, at the hearing before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs on the House Joint Resolution No. 166 concerning the termination of the treaty of 1832, addressing the said committee, said: [40]

The question presented for your consideration is one with which you are so familiar that it scarcely needs presentation on my part. For 40 years Russia has disregarded, as we think, the plain stipulations of this treaty. She has undertaken to apply a rigid test to American citizens seeking to enter Russia. We do not believe that this Government can afford to submit to any such test as applied to any part of its citizens. We believe that every American citizen, whatever his antecedents, is entitled to the benefits of a treaty made for every American citizen and every class of American citizenship. The Government of the United States has on its part strictly observed the obligations of their treaty, and Russia alone has been derelict in performance. It seems that when an American citizen presents a passport to the Russian consul general in New York, or in any foreign capital, for a visa he is immediately asked what is his religion. There are a few other questions also asked, but that seems to be the important one. The minute he confesses that he is a Jew the visa is refused and discrimination is at once made against a certain part of our citizens—a very large and important element of our citizens. Our diplomatic history is full of protests on the part of this Government against this discrimination. Large efforts have been made to get Russia to recede from a position which is utterly and wholly untenable, but without success. The time has now come when we believe that this committee and Congress should take a firm stand on this question and should insist that Russia live up to the treaty or that it be abrogated. We do not believe that any satisfactory result is going to be accomplished any other way.

---

[34] U. S. For. Rel., 1902, pp. 42–43. As to the attitude of the powers approached by the United States Government, see U. S. For. Rel., 1903, p. 704.

[35] A more detailed account of the Kishinev affair is given in Oscar S. Straus (former Ambassador to Turkey and former Secretary of Commerce and Labor of the United States) Under Four Administrations, Boston and New York, Houghton Mifflin Co., 1922, p. 170ff.

[36] Straus, Oscar S., op. cit., p. 171.

[37] Ibid., p. 172: For other diplomatic correspondence concerning "outrages perpetrated on Jews in Russia" see U. S. For. Rel., 1903, p. 712ff.

[38] The petition had been proposed by a committee from the B'nai B'rith Order, consisting of Simon Wolf, Adolf Moses, Julius Bien, Jacob Furth, Solomon Sulzberger, and Joseph D. Coons, and headed by their president, Leo N. Levi. This committee had "called upon Secretary Hay and presented to him a statement regarding the massacres in Russia, together with a proposed petition which they wished forwarded to the Government of the Czar"; Straus, op. cit., p. 171. The full text of the petition is reprinted in Adler, C., The Voice of America on Kishineff, Philadelphia, Jewish Publication Society of America, 1904, p. 478ff.

[39] However, in planning the cable as he did, says Mr. Straus, "the President was right in his anticipation. * * * Official Russia was made to realize the aroused indignation and the public protests of the civilized world." (See Straus, op. cit., p. 173.)

[40] United States Congress, House, Committee on Foreign Affairs, hearing (Dec. 11, 1911) on the termination of the treaty of 1832 between the United States and Russia, Washington, Government Printing Office, 1911 (revised edition), p. 4.

The House Joint Resolution No. 166, providing for the termination of the treaty of 1832 between the United States and Russia, is here given in full: [41]

Resolved, etc., That the people of the United States assert as a fundamental principle that the rights of its citizens shall not be impaired at home or abroad because of race or religion; that the Government of the United States concludes its treaties for the equal protection of all classes of its citizens, without regard to race or religion; that the Government of the United States will not be a party to any treaty which discriminates, or which by one of the parties thereto is so construed as to discriminate, between American citizens on the ground of race or religion; that the Government of Russia has violated the treaty between the United States and Russia, concluded at St. Petersburg December 18, 1832, refusing to honor American passports duly issued to American citizens on account of race and religion; that in the judgment of the Congress the said treaty, for the reasons aforesaid, ought to be terminated at the earliest possible time; that for the aforesaid reasons the said treaty is hereby declared to be terminated and of no further force and effect from the expiration of 1 year after the date of notification to the Government of Russia of the terms of this resolution, and that to this end the President is hereby charged with the duty of communicating such notice to the Government of Russia.

The hearings referred to above are supplemented by four appendixes dealing with the following subjects: (1) Diplomatic correspondence respecting the passport question; [42] (2) the passport question, a reprint from the American Jewish Yearbook 5672; [43] (3) brief on the termination of treaties, by Dr. Herbert Friedenwald; [44] and (4) the passport question in Congress, 1879–1909.[45]

On December 18, 1911, President William H. Taft informed the Senate of the United States that—

By instructions which I caused the Secretary of State to transmit to the American Ambassador at St. Petersburg on the 15th day of December 1911, there was given to the Imperial Russian Government, under the date of the 17th day of December 1911, official notification, on behalf of this Government, of intention to terminate the operation of the treaty of commerce and navigation of December 18, 1832, between the United States and Russia upon the expiration of the year commencing on the 1st of January 1912.[46]

STIPULATIONS CONCERNING RACIAL AND RELIGIOUS MINORITIES IN THE PEACE TREATIES FOLLOWING THE WORLD WAR

Article 63 of the treaty of peace between the allied and associated powers and Austria [47] signed at St. Germain-en-Laye on September 10, 1919, contains the following stipulations:

Austria undertakes to ensure full and complete protection of life and liberty to all inhabitants of Austria without distinction of birth, nationality, race, or religion.

All inhabitants of Austria shall be entitled to the free exercise, whether public or private, of any creed, religion, or belief whose practices are not inconsistent with public order or public morals.

The said treaty of September 10, 1919, was signed also by the American delegates, but it failed of ratification by the Senate of the United States. However, another treaty establishing friendly relations was signed at Vienna on August 24, 1921,[48] by the plenipotentiaries of the United States and of the Republic of Austria. This treaty was duly ratified by both powers concerned and proclaimed on November 17, 1921. Article 1 of this agreement provides that:[49]

Austria undertakes to accord to the United States, and the United States shall have and enjoy all the rights, privileges, indemnities, reparations, or advantages specified * * * including all the rights and advantages stipulated for the benefit of the United States in the Treaty of St. Germain-en-Laye, which the United States shall fully enjoy, notwithstanding the fact that such treaty has not been ratified by the United States. The United States, in availing itself of the rights and advantages stipulated in the provisions of that treaty, will do so in a manner consistent with the rights accorded to Austria under such provisions.

[41] U. S. Congress, House, Committee on Foreign Affairs, Hearing (Dec. 11, 1911), p. 3.

[42] Ibid., p. 105ff.

[43] Ibid., p. 239ff.

[44] Ibid., p. 295ff.

[45] Ibid., p. 304ff. This is a reprint from the American Jewish Yearbook, 5670.

[46] Message of the President of the United States (62d Cong., 2d sess., S. Doc. No. 161), p. 1.

[47] Treaties, conventions, international acts, etc. (67th Cong., 4th sess., S. Doc. No. 348), vol. 3, p. 3176. Similar provisions were included in the treaties with Czechoslovakia, Poland, Hungary, Rumania, and the Serb-Croat-Slovene State; see op. cit., pp. 3563, 3703, 3718, 3727, and 3735.

[48] For text of this treaty, see op. cit., p. 2493ff.

[49] Op. cit., p. 2495.

As far as Germany is concerned, the German delegation in their comments on the conditions of peace which were presented to them at the conclusion of the World War by the Allied and Associated Powers, including the United States of America, issued the following statement:[50]

Germany advocates in principle the protection of national minorities. This protection may be settled to the best purpose within the scope of the League of Nations. Germany, on her part, however, must demand such assurances as are already fixed by the peace treaty for those German minorities which, by cession, will pass over into alien sovereignty. Such minorities must be afforded the possibility of cultivating their German characteristics, especially through permission to maintain and attend German schools and churches, and to publish German papers. A still more extensive cultural autonomy based on national registration (Kataster) would be desirable. Germany, on her part, is resolved to treat minorities of alien origin in her territories according to the same principles.

Again the treaty between the United States and Germany signed at Washington, December 8, 1923, and proclaimed October 14, 1925,[51] in its first article provided that—

The nationals of each of the high contracting parties shall be permitted to enter, travel, and reside in the territories of the other; to exercise liberty of conscience and freedom of worship; to engage in professional, scientific, religious, philanthropic, manufacturing, and commercial work of every kind without interference, * * * and generally to do anything incidental to or necessary for the enjoyment of any of the foregoing privileges upon the same terms as nationals of the State of residence or as nationals of the nation hereafter to be most favored by it, submitting themselves to all local laws and regulations duly established.

ABOLISHMENT OF DISCRIMINATIONS IN SOVIET RUSSIA

Recent correspondence [52] between the President of the United States and Maxim M. Litvinov, People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, in connection with the recognition of that country by the United States,[53] dealt in part with the discriminations in former years by Russia in respect of passport visas and religious liberty.

On November 16, 1933, President Roosevelt wrote to Mr. Litvinoff:

As I have told you in our recent conversations, it is my expectation that after the establishment of normal relations between our two countries many Americans will reside temporarily or permanently within the territory of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and I am deeply concerned that they should enjoy in all respects the same freedom of conscience and religious liberty which they enjoy at home. * * * We will expect that religious groups or congregations composed of nationals of the United States of America in the territory of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics will be given the right to have their spiritual needs ministered to by clergymen, priests, rabbis, or other ecclesiastical functionaries who are nationals of the United States of America, and that such clergymen, priests, rabbis, or other ecclesiastical functionaries will be protected from all disability or persecution and will not be denied entry into the territory of the Soviet Union because of their ecclesiastical status.

In a letter of the same date—November 16, 1933—to the President of the United States, Mr. Litvinov, in regard to the "free exercise of liberty of conscience and religious worship", pointed out that according to the Russian decree of January 23, 1918, article 3—

Every person may profess any religion or none. All restrictions of rights connected with the profession of any belief whatsoever, or with the nonprofession of any belief, are annulled.

Article 5 of the same decree provided that—

A free performance of religious rites is guaranteed as long as it does not interfere with public order and is not accompanied by interference with the rights of citizens of the Soviet Union.

As to the matter of passports, Mr. Litvinov wrote to the President that—

I have the honor to inform you that the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, while reserving to itself the

[50] International conciliation, October 1919, no. 143, Comments by the German delegation on the conditions of peace, p. 1228.

[51] The full text of this treaty is printed in 44 U. S. Stats. at Large, pt. III, p. 2132ff.

[52] United States President, 1933 (Franklin D. Roosevelt), exchange of communications between the President of the United States and Maxim M. Litvinov, Washington, 1933.

[53] See Ibid. See also Moore, Hon. R. W., Recognition of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, U. S. Department of State, Publ. No. 557, Washington, Government Printing Office, 1934.

right of refusing visas to Americans desiring to enter the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on personal grounds, does not intend to base such refusals on the fact of such persons having an ecclesiastical status.[54]

On November 16, 1933, a few minutes before midnight,[55] the President of the United States accorded recognition to the Government of Soviet Russia.

I have set forth in detail these various intercessions by the United States as clear indications of precedents upon which to base the passage of my resolution, House Resolution 70, in the interests of those who worship the Catholic faith in Mexico. This resolution, I feel, expresses the views of the majority of all fair-minded persons, even those who are not directly affected by the existent oppressions and proscriptions.

In conclusion, it is well in this connection to recall the letter written by our great George Washington to the Hebrew congregation in Newport, R. I. He said:

The citizens of the United States of America have the right to applaud themselves for having given to mankind examples of an enlarged and liberal policy, a policy worthy of invitation. All possess alike liberty of conscience and immunities of citizenship. It is now no more that toleration is spoken of, as if it was by the indulgence of one class of people that another enjoyed the exercise of their inherent natural rights. For happily the Government of the United States, which gives to bigotry no sanction, the persecution no assistance, requires only that they who live under its protection should bemean themselves as good citizens, in giving it on all occasions their effectual support. * * * May the children of the stock of Abraham, who dwell in this land, continue to merit and enjoy the good will of the other inhabitants; while everyone shall sit in safety under his own vine and fig tree, and there shall be none to make him afraid.

It is indeed hoped that the Catholics in Mexico shall soon "sit in safety under their own vine and fig tree, and there shall be none to make them afraid."

I herewith set forth a copy of my resolution.

Whereas serious anti-Catholic outbreaks have occurred in Mexico under the regime of the National Revolutionary Party under President General Lazaro Cardenas; and

Whereas the oppressions and proscriptions of Catholics now practiced in Mexico hark back to an age of barbarism; and

Whereas American citizens of Catholic faith have been outraged and insulted, their homes invaded, and their lives placed in jeopardy; and

Whereas a cruel and benighted antireligious policy of the present Mexican Government has not only unduly restricted the number of priests that might officiate in some States, but in other States has outrageously forbidden the ministrations of any priest or prelate; and

Whereas the Chamber of Deputies of Mexico has unanimously voted the expulsion from the country of every archbishop and bishop; and

Whereas the present Mexican Government prohibits public and private religious education of children as a matter of national policy; and

Whereas such anti-Catholic action in Mexico involves the denial of the fundamental rights of every human being, in a spirit contrary to the traditions of American freedom of conscience, religion, and liberty; and

Whereas distinguished Protestant, Jewish, and Catholic laymen and clergy, as well as important religious and interdenominational organizations and societies have emphatically registered protest against such Mexican policies; and

Whereas the Government of Mexico has even encouraged an economic boycott against those professing and practicing Catholicism; and

Whereas Catholics are expelled from public office and are being driven from the professions; and

Whereas Catholics who complain of Mexican intolerance are summarily dealt with: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives, in Congress assembled, deems it fitting and proper to protest the anti-Catholic practices of the present rulers of Mexico; and that it views with gravest concern such primitive and barbaric persecution of helpless men and women who have committed no crime and who have become victims of racial hate; be it further

Resolved, That it condemns the cruelties and insults that have been practiced against our nationals who are Catholics domiciled in Mexico; and be it further

Resolved, That it calls upon the Government of Mexico, in the name of common humanity, to cease denying fundamental and inalienable rights to those who may be resident in Mexico, be they Catholic or non-Catholic.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. SANDERS] for 20 minutes.

[54] Exchange of Communications, 1933 (op. cit.), p. 9.
[55] Moore, R. W., op. cit., p. 1.

Mr. SANDERS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I have been allotted 20 minutes, for which I thank the House. Twenty hours would scarce suffice to tell one-half the tale. However, there have been so many rumors and contradictory reports as to what is happening in Louisiana, and so many Members have asked me for information, that I felt constrained to request this time of the House to make this necessarily brief statement. Due to my limited time many things on which you have sought information must necessarily remain unanswered.

On last Monday, January 28, there appeared the following editorial in the Washington Post:

FRUITS OF DICTATORSHIP

Louisiana came very near to a state of civil war on Saturday. Only the fact that National Guardsmen hopelessly outnumbered the "citizen revolters" seems to have averted a battle. Apparently men and women are so deeply aroused over the activities of the Huey Long dictatorship that they are ready to fight to terminate his power.

At a recent mass meeting in Baton Rouge a solemn appeal was made for funds to carry on the fight against dictatorship and to care for the families of any who may be killed or injured in the anticipated struggle. This organization does not appear to be strong enough to cope with the political machine which is strangling Louisiana, and certainly it can accomplish nothing by provoking bloodshed. Yet it indicates the inevitable reaction to unscrupulous dictatorship in an American State.

The formation of battle lines on Saturday constitutes a grave stop, look, and listen sign. When election laws are adjusted to favor a clique in power, when corrupt-practices statutes are repealed, when every State employee becomes subservient to dictation or loses his job, and when citizens are subjected to ruthless reprisals for opposition to the machine, revolt by self-respecting citizens becomes inevitable. The politicians who have brought Louisiana to this sorry plight may well take time for reflection before the course which they are pursuing leads to actual bloodshed.

I have just received a telegram from Louisiana which, as much as any other incident, reveals the tenseness prevailing in that State today. I wish to read in part the message I have just received by wire from Louisiana:

Here is true and exact story of the blackjacking and beating of Leon M. Trice, 119-pound Associated Press photographer, by Joe Messina, one of HUEY LONG's bodyguards, and by others this morning: Trice had been assigned to take pictures of arrival of Senator LONG. He went to the L. & N. depot, where at least 20 armed members had assembled to meet the Senator. Several of these gunmen at least are ex-convicts, recently pardoned by Governor Allen. They belong to LONG's secret service force, known as the "Bureau of Criminal Identification." No one told Trice not to take pictures or give him any warning. As Senator LONG was approached by an A. P. reporter, Trice raised his camera to take the picture. Joe Messina, one of LONG's bodyguards, who had come with LONG on the trip, hit him on the back of the head with a blackjack twice, grabbed his camera, aided by several other gunmen, and they commenced kicking it around. Trice tried to save his camera, begging them, "Please don't break my machine." The boy was almost unconscious at the time from the blows. As he raised up he was struck several times in the face, his lips and his face bruised. Messina by this time had been joined by several other gunmen. LONG shouted, "Give it to him, Joe." With Trice down, LONG and his crowd rushed to automobiles and dashed from the depot. At the hospital, doctor said that had the blackjack blows been one-half inch lower, Trice would have been killed. Regardless of what accounts reach Washington, this is an absolutely true version of the affair.

That unrest, contrary to some reports that have been published, is not objection to any particular tax; neither is this unrest brought about by big business fomenting revolution. Such a charge is not serious and is not considered seriously by anyone in Louisiana. The situation that exists in that State goes much deeper than any such theories as these.

Fundamental questions of government are involved in Louisiana today. The dominant faction in that State, under the leadership of the spokesman for that faction, has shown a steadily increasing distrust of and profound contempt for democratic institutions and for the orderly processes of democratic government. This had not become apparent at the last election some 3 years ago, but since that time there has been going on in Louisiana a steady encroachment upon the rights of popular self-government. Although the spokesman for the faction in power invariably proclaims himself as the champion of the common man, there has nevertheless been a persistent, well-ordered program by which the rights of the people have been and are being steadily curtailed.

Locally elected officials have by legislative act been superseded by officials designated by the executive. Powers that were formerly distributed among the sixty-odd parishes—counties—of the State, numerous departments of State government, have been concentrated into the hands of the chief executive.

To give you a few instances, and a few only: The corrupt practices act in that State has been repealed. The election laws of that State have been so altered that complete power is now lodged in the hands of the executive, giving complete control over all election machinery. I have time to give you only a few instances as illustrative and to call to your mind what is going on in Louisiana today. Under the laws passed by the State legislature within the past few weeks every policeman on every police force in every city, town, village, and hamlet today is hired and fired by the State machine. Every fireman in the State of Louisiana in every city, town, village, and hamlet within the last few weeks has been put on the pay roll of the State machine, not paid by the State but hired and fired by the State.

For decades and generations in Louisiana, as in every other State, there have been attempts to take schools out of politics and to eliminate them from political control. Within the past few weeks over 15,000 school teachers in the State of Louisiana have suddenly found themselves transferred from the nonpartisan control of school boards in the various communities, and today by legislative act they hold their jobs at the mercy of the State machine. Every assessment of each individual taxpayer and business institution in the State of Louisiana is raised or lowered indefinitely by a tax assessment control board, controlled by the State machine.

Through a combination of laws, including the complete control by the State machine of every State bank through the State banking examiner, plus the control of the debt moratorium commission, who is also the State bank examiner, every business in the State is completely at the mercy of the State machine. Add to this a horde of secret State police, unknown to the public as to identity, practically unlimited in number, with practically no check upon the number hired or the amount spent for such, and with no earthly duty to perform save to play politics, secure political information, and play the part usually reserved for the private spies and informers of dictatorships. These are only a few of the many instances of the concentration of power that has been effected in Louisiana during the last 12 months. There has been no such concentration of power in the hands of any American executive since the signing of the Declaration of Independence.

This process of concentration of powers has been gradual but has been gaining momentum and growing with increasing acceleration. Many of these moves have been popular with the individual members of the faction in power because the actual operation of these laws have almost invariably been directed at officials of the opposing political faith, thus resulting in increased power and more jobs for the faction in control.

Entire communities that had grown to accept the right of election as a part of their American birthright have suddenly found themselves deprived of what they had heretofore regarded as an inalienable right of citizenship. Thus, Baton Rouge, a community which is as restrained, level-headed, and tolerant as can be found anywhere in this country, suddenly found itself stripped of its right to select its own officials by the action of a hostile legislature, dominated by the machine, only to have these officials appointed by the executive.

A survey of the situation will satisfy any reasonable investigator that democratic institutions and the orderly processes of democratic government are rapidly disappearing in Louisiana. The American ideal of a democratic government, with all power lodged in the people, with each community electing its own officials, is being displaced by the Asiatic conception of government of an all-powerful chief executive, who rules the whole people for the benefit of the dominant faction or class. The Asiatic conception of government underlies the Hitler government in Germany and the Stalin government in Russia. The name or title of the ruler is immaterial, whether he be called shah or khan, dictator, or have no title at all. The theory is that of an all-powerful chief executive, with the power of government concentrated in one office, and the purpose of his rule is the rule of the many for the benefit of a dominant class.

It is useless to state that this Asiatic conception of government is entirely foreign to the spirit of American democracy, and, unfortunately, it is this Asiatic conception of despotic government which is exemplified in the political practices put into effect by the dominant faction in Louisiana today.

The increasing perception of this basic fact is the cause of the growing unrest among the people of Louisiana.

The frequent use of the militia in Louisiana indicates one of two facts:

(a) Either the militia is being used where no just cause exists; or

(b) There is frequent and alarming unrest among the people necessitating the use of the militia.

The fact is that in Louisiana the State Militia has become merely the arm of the dominant political faction. Any community in Louisiana in which there is decided opposition to the present regime lives in daily and hourly expectation of a declaration of martial law in that community, to be followed by complete annihilation of that community's right of local government. This is what is actually happening on this day and hour in Baton Rouge.

Martial law in Baton Rouge! Martial law in placid, easy-going, peaceful, law-abiding, tolerant, loyal, courageous, patient, long-suffering Baton Rouge!

So peaceful and law abiding is her citizenry that crimes of violence are almost unknown there. Mobs and riots are things unknown to our people. There is no excuse, no possible justification for this great outrage upon one of the finest American cities to be found on this continent.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SANDERS of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. BURDICK. Newspaper reports carried the information that a band of citizens had taken possession of some public building before any militia was called out. Is this true?

Mr. SANDERS of Louisiana. I am going to touch upon that in just a moment and I trust I shall answer the gentleman.

Why should this thing be? Why have we martial law in Baton Rouge today?

I will tell you why. Because the people of Baton Rouge, through long years of persecution, oppression, coercion, and attempted bribery and intimidation, patiently, steadfastly, without excitement, and without turmoil, grimly and persistently, in the face of overwhelming odds, and with a heroism worthy of the highest traditions of America, have gone to the polls on election day and voted their convictions, instead of the bidding of a dictator.

The dictator found that he could not buy, he could not bribe, he could not bulldoze, he could not intimidate the spirit of this intrepid people, and so like every dictator since time began he has set out to destroy what he cannot control.

That is why we have martial law in Baton Rouge today.

Unable to elect officials there, the dictator of the State had the laws changed by a complacent legislature, so that he might appoint. Because this little community had refused to bow the knee to Baal, swiftly and without warning, its citizens found themselves stripped of their suffrage, and helpless before a foe they knew to be ruthless, vicious, and corrupt.

Excitement! Of course there was excitement. Is there any community anywhere in this Nation from Maine to California, from Canada to the Gulf, that could submit to being deprived of what it considered its inalienable rights of American citizenship without excitement, murmur, or protest? If there be such a community, then it deserves not the name of America, and as for me, I want none of it.

Under this greatest of all possible provocation, what happened? The parish and city governments taken over by a

powerful foe, long successfully resisted, the streets filled with State police, rumors in the air, our people did what any people would have been expected to do. They held a meeting. Where did they hold it? In some dark and hidden corner as conspirators? When did they hold it? At midnight under the cover of darkness?

No; by the grace of God, they met in open daylight on the afternoon of the very day that the rape of the parish and city governments was consummated, and they met in that traditional meeting place of American citizens—in the parish courthouse. It is said that some carried weapons. Under the circumstances this is not surprising, but they carried them openly, and the Constitution guarantees to our American citizens the right to carry arms. This, be it remembered, was before martial law had been declared.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have 10 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. SANDERS of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. BLANTON. At the time when the gentleman had honest elections in his district, with these very intolerable conditions mentioned by him at issue, the gentleman was elected to this Congress by a handsome majority. I want to ask the gentleman, with these intolerable conditions now existing and with the election machinery taken over, would the gentleman have any chance at any future election? [Laughter.]

Mr. SANDERS of Louisiana. I will answer the gentleman by stating that nobody knows what is going to happen in Louisiana within the next 12 months.

Mr. BLANTON. If the conditions are as bad as the gentleman depicts, I think we ought to furnish the gentleman with a pretty good-sized bodyguard to look after him. [Laughter.]

Mr. SANDERS of Louisiana. I will answer the gentleman in this way. Down in my country, sir, I need no bodyguard—or anywhere else. [Applause.]

Mr. BLANTON. I shall tender the gentleman my services if he needs any help. [Laughter.]

Mr. SANDERS of Louisiana. I thank the gentleman.

I wish to call the attention of the House to this fact: There was no mob action and there was no violence there. The people met and they discussed this most unusual and most un-American incident, and then, of their own motion, they dispersed peacefully and went to their homes. Is there any community that would have taken this situation without comment, without protest, and without discussion and excitement? If there be such in this Nation, it deserved not the name of American, and as for me, I want none of it. [Applause.]

Mr. BURDICK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SANDERS of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. BURDICK. My criticism was not so much leveled against the citizens in the first instance, but I wanted to find out whether the gentleman is speaking about the machine in Louisiana or a dictator—I do not know which he means.

Mr. SANDERS of Louisiana. The dictator who is in control of the machine.

Mr. BURDICK. Who is the dictator?

Mr. SANDERS of Louisiana. HUEY LONG—I did not know that the gentleman had any doubt on that subject. [Laughter.]

Mr. BURDICK. If that is the purpose of the gentleman's discussion, if it is only leveled against one who is a Member of the United States Senate, I want to raise a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Louisiana yield to the gentleman from North Dakota to make a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. SANDERS of Louisiana. I decline to yield.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Louisiana declines to yield further.

Mr. SANDERS of Louisiana. Martial law in Baton Rouge! This is the fruit of the determination of that community to exercise its God-given right under the American Constitution of voting as it pleases.

Martial law in Baton Rouge! There had been no violence there. The only violence, be it noted, that has happened in Baton Rouge was the shooting down in cold blood of George Alessi. Who is George Alessi, and how was he shot?

George Alessi is of the finest type of American citizen of Italian descent. Plain, blunt, outspoken, fearless George Alessi. My personal friend, and I am proud of his friendship. An outstanding business man of the thriving little city of Independence. A member of the police jury of the parish of Tangipahoa. I wish to read to you his statement, in part, as given to the press:

> As we passed the Baton Rouge Airport we saw a crowd gathering, and we stopped. I did not have any gun. There were about 100 men on the north side of the airport when a number of automobiles containing National Guardsmen came onto the field. Not having any gun myself, I, with others who were like situated, started going toward the woods so I could protect myself behind the trees; I saw two men in plain clothes standing near a tree. One of them pulled his pistol and pointed it at me. I told him I was not armed, but he shot me anyway. The bullet passed through my body. The pain was so great I could not stay on the ground. As I raised up with my hands outward a man fired at me with a shotgun. I don't know whether he shot once or twice.

We hear a lot of talk about an investigation of an alleged "plot."

It is highly significant of conditions in Louisiana that there has not been one word said by State authorities about any investigation into the attempted murder of George Alessi.

Judge W. Carruth Jones, one of the district judges in Baton Rouge, is a fearless and competent jurist, a man of unimpeachable integrity. The prosecuting official, Judge Odom, is a man of character and ability, one of the best prosecuting attorneys in the State. Should these local authorities conduct an investigation and secure conviction in this dastardly outrage, it is only too melancholy a fact to state that in all human likelihood an executive pardon would stay the hand of justice and free the culprit. A member of the State machine in Louisiana is above the law, save and except the will of the dictator. Specific instances abound which could be cited.

The fact that George Alessi is an outspoken opponent of the dictatorship in Louisiana has probably put him outside the protection of the law. He is beyond the pale.

This talk of a plot to assassinate the principal spokesman of the dominant faction in Louisiana is nothing new. We have similar tales of alleged "plots uncovered" in nearly every election and in practically any instance when the use of the National Guard is thought to be necessary.

There was an alleged "plot" uncovered at Bunkie, in central Louisiana, during the last judicial campaign; I forgot who the assassins were supposed to be. There was another alleged "plot uncovered" in Alexandria recently, when someone threw a rotten egg at the chief spokesman for the State administration. I forget who the plotters were supposed to be, but, as a result of the uncovering of that particular "plot", the chief of police of Alexandria, Mr. Clint O'Malley, an outspoken political opponent of the State machine, was removed from office and his job filled by a supporter of the present regime. During the election in New Orleans last fall there was quite a hullabaloo about another alleged "plot", all directed against the same inveterate plottee. I do not remember who these "plotters" were and do not know that their names were ever made public, but an obliging legislature punished the plotters by turning over a number of jobs formerly held by the city authorities to the chief executive.

It is to be noted that none of these plotters have ever been brought to trial. The technic has always been the same. Announcement of an alleged "plot", followed by a radio skit based upon the Soviet radio-trial propaganda with which we are all familiar, and then the passing of summary

laws to punish certain political opponents in the name of law and order. It is also to be noted that in each case the faction in power takes a bunch of jobs to which opponents have been elected after each "plot" has been uncovered and fills them by appointment.

Human nature changes little. Some 2,000 years ago Nero used to uncover plots against his person as the excuse to rid himself of Romans who were too popular with the people or who had money and jobs that he wanted. Judging the future by the past, I would say that this alleged "plot" in Baton Rouge recently announced will make it necessary (?) for those in power to put out of office men elected by the people who had the courage and fortitude to fight the machine, filling them by appointment, thus punishing their political opponents, at the same time rewarding the faithful, and all in the name of law and order.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has again expired.

Mr. SANDLIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana be allowed 15 minutes additional.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MILLARD. I reserve the right to object. I have no objection, provided the gentleman's opponent has the same time.

The SPEAKER. That is a matter to be determined later by the House. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SANDERS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I repeat, it is unlikely that there will ever be a court trial of any of those named in this radio skit. Should there be a trial of any political enemy of the present regime in Louisiana, I make this statement with full knowledge of its tremendous import; I make it not hastily but reluctantly. Standing here in my official capacity, as a Representative of my people in the Capitol of the United States of America, within a stone's throw of the hallowed shrine of the immortal Declaration of Independence and of the great Constitution of our Nation, I say to you that in the event of a trial of political enemies of the present regime in Louisiana, that a fair trial is an impossibility, that conviction would be foreordained and predetermined, and that any official or any judge who stood in the way would be removed and superseded by others obedient to the dominant faction, upon orders of the chief executive or by the Supreme Court of Louisiana.

The paper reports that I have read name the following, who have been mentioned by the machine as having some connection with this so-called "plot": John Fred Odom, Henry Sherburne, Sidney Dubroca, Dallas Gross, Fred Parker, and F. C. O'Rourke.

John Fred Odom has been district attorney, which is the prosecuting official of East Baton Rouge Parish, elected by the people, ever since 1916, or nearly 20 years, with a record of criminal enforcement excelled by none in the State and equaled by few. The esteem in which he is held by those who know him best is shown by his tenure of office.

Henry Sherburne has held high public elective office in the parish of Iberville for more than a quarter of a century. He served as assessor of that parish by election for 20 years, and has been sheriff there for the past 7 years, being elected without opposition. Sidney Dubroca has been the sheriff of the parish of West Baton Rouge for 23 years. Both of these officials have been elected time and time again, the chief law-enforcement officers of their respective parishes, by the people of their home communities. Dallas Gross, a private citizen of Baton Rouge, lost the business that was his rather than give up his political convictions. Fred Parker has been a deputy sheriff for the past 3 years, but refused to allow his name to be submitted to the State administration to be approved as a deputy in compliance with a recent law, because of his convictions as to the nature of the political machine in power in Louisiana. Fred O'Rourke has never held any public office. He is not an officer or executive of any oil company, neither is he the agent of anyone to foment revolution. He is an honest, hard-working workingman, one of those who earn their bread by the sweat of their faces, fearless and outspoken, accustomed to speaking his opinions on any matter under heaven in public or in private.

These men are all my friends and I am proud to call them such. Brave, outspoken opponents of the present regime in Louisiana, they are typical of all that is best in the manhood of Louisiana. These men are not now and never have been conspirators.

The situation in Louisiana poses a question of tremendous import—important not alone to Louisiana but to every State in this Union, to every Member of this Congress.

There is being constructed and forged in Louisiana today a despotism, alien in its every feature, to American tradition. Do not tell me about the Constitution. Of what avail is a constitution in the face of overwhelming force? There is being used in Louisiana today a State militia. It is being utilized by the dominant faction to overpower the strongholds of democratic government and to scatter and stamp out the flames of the watchfires of democracy. Do not say that that is impossible. Why should it be an impossibility? When the American Constitution was given to us there were many people in America that preferred a monarchy to a republic.

There are many people today who contrast the superficial superiority of a dictatorship, with its speed in decision and efficiency in operation, with the apparently relatively slow and tedious processes of democracy. They overlook the outstanding lesson from the history of the ages, that in the long and painful upward climb by the toiling masses—the workmen, the men who earn their living by the sweat of their brows, and who depend upon their daily labor to feed and clothe themselves and their families—in the long ascent from the valley of despair up to the yet far-distant sun-kissed heights—in that agonizing upward climb the helping hand to the toiling masses has ever come from democratic institutions, from those who believe in the widest possible diffusion of power among its people, whose watchword and battle cry is "Equal rights for all, special privileges for none"; while the foe, the willing tool and powerful ally of special privilege, has ever been the dictator, willing to enslave humanity for his own advancement.

Of what avail is a constitution? What availed the Constitution of Greece against Philip of Macedon and the Macedonian phalanx? Of what avail was the Constitution of the French Republic against Napoleon's dream of empire when backed by the French Army? Of what avail is the Constitution of Louisiana against the dominant faction in control of the State militia? There is no power in Louisiana today, no force that can possibly withstand the State militia. Of course, who wants to precipitate civil war of that nature anyway? But do not answer me by saying that what I am telling you of the erection of a despotism in America is an impossibility. Of what avail the Constitution of the United States itself against a strong, determined force trying to overwhelm it?

The only possible answer is equal or superior force plus determination to utilize it if necessary. It is not what is written on the printed pages of a book but what is written in the hearts and minds of men that determines their destinies. I tell you gentlemen who sit upon my left there is an edifice being constructed in Louisiana today that is the very antithesis of the concept of that great Republican President, Abraham Lincoln.

The conflict now being fought in Louisiana presages a conflict that will soon be fought throughout the United States. The question is a fundamental one. Shall we discard democracy and set up a government by dictatorship? In the old days he was called a king. Today he is called by many names; but call him whatever name you will, the conception of this type of government is utterly and entirely opposed to the American ideal, contrary to the very fundamentals of American traditions, and certainly contrary to the conception of the type of government pledged by the great Republican President, Abraham Lincoln: "A government of the people, by the people, for the people."

And the American people might do well, in the light of the experience through which Louisiana is passing, to pon-

der this immortal saying of that great Democrat, the author of the Declaration of Independence, Thomas Jefferson:

Sometimes it is said that man cannot be trusted with the government of himself. Can he, then, be trusted with the government of others? Or have we found angels in the form of kings to govern him? Let history answer this question.

[Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. FERNANDEZ] for 20 minutes.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I sincerely regret that it is necessary to occupy the floor today to discuss Louisiana politics in the National House of Representatives, but I deem it my duty to my people to give to the Congress of the United States the other side of the question.

Now, my friends, my distinguished colleague from Louisiana [Mr. SANDERS] is unnecessarily alarmed at conditions in Louisiana today, just as he was when I was a candidate for the National House of Representatives last September, and he appealed, with all of his eloquence, to the President of the United States to have the State militia withdrawn and, if necessary, to send Federal troops into New Orleans. In a few moments I will quote the Congressman's telegram.

While our present distinguished Speaker of the House was majority leader, the gentleman from Louisiana also appealed to him to send an unofficial committee into Louisiana to watch my election. It is needless for me to tell you what the present distinguished occupant of the chair replied to the gentleman from Louisiana. But I say, sincerely and honestly, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman is unnecessarily alarmed, and I intend to prove it, if I have the time.

I will now endeavor to answer some of his statements in a chronological order. The gentleman from Louisiana, among other things, stated that we have a dictatorship in Louisiana; that constitutional government is gone. Why, Mr. Speaker, we have 100 delegates in our State house of representatives, and we have 39 State senators in the upper branch of the legislature. Just as happens in the case of the Democratic majority in the United States House of Representatives, the delegates in the State legislature confer in caucus before legislation is presented on the floor of the house and senate. It is not one man who controls; it is a majority of the 100 men in the State house of representatives and the majority of the State senators—all elected by the people of the State.

While we are talking about dictatorship, Mr. Speaker, permit me to say that I have had perhaps a little more experience in politics than my distinguished friend. I had the honor of being a member of the constitutional convention of 1921 under Governor Parker. Call him a dictator if you will, but ex-Governor Sanders, father of my colleague, at that time was just as much a dictator in the affairs of the administration of Governor Parker as Senator LONG is in the affairs of Governor Allen today. I served in the house of representatives under Governor Fuqua. No person who was informed on the then-existing conditions will deny that Governor Fuqua was dictated to in his politics and in his policies by the then ex-Governor, J. Y. Sanders. We may as well be frank about these things.

The gentleman from Louisiana read a telegram to the effect that a newspaper reporter was assaulted by one of the Senator's bodyguards. Mr. Speaker, this is the fourth time this newspaper reporter, Mr. Trice, has been in trouble, and I can prove this statement. I leave it to the Members to form their own conclusions as to why he was beaten up, if he were; and I have no reason to doubt that he was.

My friend the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] propounded a question to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. SANDERS] about elections. Permit me to say to my good friend from Texas that we had an election in the Congressman's own district long before any so-called "dictatorial" State laws were passed; two judges were running for office—Judge Ott, supported by the Long faction, and Judge Tycer, supported by the faction of my colleague. It is needless to tell you that in some of the parishes in the congressional district of the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. SANDERS] the Long candidate won and is sitting on the court in that district today. That is not all the elections we have had; I will come to the others later.

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

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I yield.

Mr. BLANTON. That was just what I was fearful of; that if the conditions are as our friend depicted them, the power that is exerted there now can elect all of the judges and all other officials.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Before I conclude, Mr. Speaker, I expect to prove by the words of our opponents, the newspapers, that elections in Louisiana are fair and square.

The gentleman from Louisiana stated that the corrupt-practice law was repealed. I complied with the corrupt-practice act, my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MALONEY] complied, and, I think, all of the candidates on the Long side complied with the corrupt-practice act; but I had to complain to the grand jury in New Orleans to get my opponents to comply with the corrupt-practice act. The district attorney, Hon. Eugene Stanley, not a political friend of LONG's, told me that this specific act should be repealed; and I believe every sane man and every sane attorney in Louisiana agrees that that special act should have been repealed.

Fault is found also, Mr. Speaker, about the school teachers' being under a political machine. That act, passed by the Louisiana Legislature, provided nothing more than that the school boards throughout the State should submit to the State board of education their budgets; that is all.

To talk about the firemen and the police departments of all of the cities of Louisiana being controlled by Senator LONG is ridiculous. The only thing the legislature requires the police and fire departments and the sheriffs to do is to report the names, the addresses, and the qualifications of the patrolmen, the sheriffs, and the firemen in the State; that is all it provides.

The gentleman talks about members of the bureau of identification going around as secret service men without uniforms. I recall that during the incumbency of the distinguished gentleman's father, Mr. Sanders, as Governor of Louisiana, he was the creator of the game wardens law in the State of Louisiana which gave to our State that system of having policemen around the State with badges as conservation agents; that is where the system had its genesis.

Mr. SANDERS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I yield.

Mr. SANDERS of Louisiana. Is there any distinction between a game warden and a member of the criminal-identification bureau?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. They were used for the same purpose during that administration as Governor Allen uses them, and the gentleman knows it.

Mr. Speaker, may I say that if you had a bond of the State of Louisiana in your pocket today you could get 99½ cents for it. In comparison with the bonds of the city of New Orleans under the regime of Walmsley and the faction of Sanders and Sullivan and the rest of the "outs" who are trying to get in, the city of New Orleans bonds are selling at 94 and 95. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to take up too much time of the House. I think the gentleman from Louisiana is unduly alarmed. I hope to prove that he was unduly alarmed in my election. He had no opposition. I fought the city machine, and by the grace of God and the help of Senator HUEY LONG I was elected to Congress. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. KVALE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KVALE. From the gentleman's conduct on the floor, there is an indication that there was a slight amount of his own ability involved in the equation.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an article appearing in the Times-Picayune of Thursday, August 23.

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

There was no objection.

The article referred to is as follows:

[From the New Orleans Times-Picayune, Aug. 23, 1934]

SANDERS APPEALS FOR HOUSE WATCH ON ELECTION HERE—ASKS CONGRESS COMMITTEE INVESTIGATE "INCONCEIVABLE CONDITIONS"

Special to the Times-Picayune

BATON ROUGE, LA., August 22, 1934.—A request that an unofficial committee of Members of the National House of Representatives personally visit Louisiana to observe the conditions under which the congressional primaries are being held was telegraphed today by Congressman J. Y. SANDERS, Jr., to Congressman JOSEPH W. BYRNS, of Nashville, Tenn., House majority leader.

In his telegram Congressman SANDERS says the "conditions under which the primary election on September 11 for two Members of Congress in the New Orleans districts will be held are inconceivable", and asks that Congressman BYRNS, as ranking Democratic Congressman, name an unofficial committee to come to the State.

CONDITIONS INCONCEIVABLE

"I am confident", the telegram says, "that on September 11 the people of our State will overwhelmingly repudiate this effort by LONG to Hitlerize our State."

The telegram follows:

"Conditions under which the primary election on September 11 for two Members of Congress in the New Orleans districts will be held are inconceivable. Registration lists are held by the militia behind machine guns. A subservient legislature, at the dictation of Senator LONG, and despite the courageous opposition of a handful of independent legislators, has broken down every safeguard around the election laws, placing LONG and his creatures in control of every precinct in the State, and have attempted by statutory enactment to put the militia and the political machinery of the State all under his control and above the jurisdiction of the courts.

CALLS FOR INQUIRY

"He has passed laws attempting to place the military above the civil. I am confident that on September 11 the people of our State will overwhelmingly repudiate this effort by LONG to Hitlerize our State, but regardless of what action the people in Louisiana may take, whether the House of Representatives will permit an election so conducted to remain uninvestigated and without protest, is a question that involves the integrity of the House of Representatives and its continuance as a representative body. Since the sad death of Speaker Rainey leaves the House without a Speaker, I am taking the liberty of urging that you, in your capacity as majority leader of the House, appoint an unofficial committee of House Members and request them to personally visit Louisiana and see for themselves a condition which otherwise would seem too preposterous to be possible.

"J. Y. SANDERS, Jr.,
"*Member of Congress.*"

[From the New Orleans Times-Picayune, Sept. 9, 1934]

SANDERS APPEALS TO ROOSEVELT TO STOP GUARDS' USE—SAYS MOTHERS DISTRESSED AT MOBILIZATION OF BOYS FOR POLITICAL PURPOSES

By the Associated Press

BATON ROUGE, LA., September 8.—Congressman J. Y. SANDERS, Jr., of the Sixth Louisiana District, today telegraphed President Franklin D. Roosevelt protesting calling of the Louisiana National Guard by Gov. O. K. Allen "to be used solely as an arm of his political machine at the polls on election day." Congressman SANDERS said in his message that there is no breach of the peace and "no possible justification for calling out the National Guard." His telegram follows:

"President FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
"*Washington, D. C.:*

"Senator LONG, through his Governor, has mobilized National Guard in Louisiana, threatening martial law without any just cause or provocation, and to be used solely as an arm of his political machine at the polls on election day. Many of our National Guard are boys who have been called from their classes in high schools and junior colleges. Mothers and fathers of these boys are distressed and outraged that their boys should be so used for political purposes. Use of National Guard for partisan purpose in this manner is almost sure to precipitate rioting and possible bloodshed.

"On behalf of the mothers and fathers of these boys and the law-abiding citizenry of this State, I urge that you take such action as may be necessary to avoid possible impending tragedy and to prevent the misuse of the arms and equipment of National Government solely for the advantage of a political faction and to intimidate independent voters.

"There is no breach of the peace or disorder and no possible justification for calling out the National Guard."

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I am not going to take the time of the House to read this article. I will read a headline and subheadline of it. This is the Times-Picayune, August 23: "SANDERS appeals for House watch on election here." That is my election. That is the headline which asks a congressional committee to investigate inconceivable conditions. It states that "a request that an unofficial committee of the National House of Representatives personally visit Louisiana to observe the conditions under which congressional primaries are being held was telegraphed by Congressman SANDERS to Congressman BYRNS, majority leader."

Mr. Speaker, I am going to follow this up, and I am going to prove that it was the fairest, the most honest, and squarest election ever held in the State.

Here is an editorial in the New Orleans Item of September 13, 2 days after the election. I quote from the editorial:

Regardless of that it is idle to go behind the votes of the people themselves in an election so carefully scrutinized as this one was.

That is the opposition paper and the paper that fought me and Senator LONG's organization.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert two editorials in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. The editorial in the Times-Picayune of September 13 is as follows:

PRIMARY PURPOSES

The results of Tuesday's primary in New Orleans are deeply disappointing to lovers of decent and democratic government everywhere. The four candidates on the dictator's ticket received pluralities in the very city which so stingingly defeated his municipal candidates last January. By the nearly equal division of the city vote, all four of his candidates in the current race secured nominations that insure their election. The royal grip upon New Orleans thus is tightened by the votes of its own people.

The election here was peaceful and orderly throughout, with the royal army held discreetly in the background. We see no cause for questioning the general fairness of the count or the genuineness of the local verdict. Several reasons can be offered for the amazing reversal, but none of them are creditable to the New Orleans electorate and their post-mortem recital at this time could serve no useful purpose. We can only admit and accept, with such grace and philosophy as we can muster, the fact that slightly more than half the New Orleans voters who cast their ballots Tuesday registered their submission to the Long dictatorship, and their acquiescence in its works and methods. Their submission amounts, for all practical and political purposes, to sanction of the abuses and usurpations under which we suffer.

Elsewhere over the State the dictatorship did not fare so well, though Judge Ott, its reputed candidate for the first circuit court of Appeal, defeated Judge Tycer. Representative SANDLIN, anti-LONG, was renominated in the Fourth Congressional District with a decisive majority. Representative WILSON, of the fifth, led the field and enters the second primary with a substantial plurality over the runner-up. In the Sixth District, represented by J. Y. SANDERS, Jr., anti-LONG, there was no contest, and Representative MONTET, of the Third District, likewise was unopposed. In the seventh, Representative DEROUEN won handily over a share-the-wealth opponent, and in the eighth Representative DEAR polled an emphatic majority over an ardent and obedient follower of the dictator. Judge Porter won the nomination for supreme court justice in the third supreme court district. Thus the royal drive for complete ownership of Louisiana's delegation in the Federal House, and for control of the Louisiana Supreme Court, encountered serious reverses and fell considerably short of its objective. Despite the temporary defection and set-back here in New Orleans, the fight against dictatorship has developed new strength and vigor in the State outside.

The editorial appearing in the New Orleans Item of September 13 is as follows:

THE CITY ELECTION

Nothing remains in the way of political amenities connected with the strange campaign in the districts of which New Orleans is part but to congratulate the four winners on the Long ticket.

Since we think the voters of the city made a mistake in the bestowal of their ballots, it might be in order to commiserate with them on their choices. But that may be premature, and therefore may as well be postponed until the practical results are observed. These belong to the future. We hope they won't be as bad as they might.

Regardless of that, it is idle to go behind the votes of the people themselves in an election so carefully scrutinized as this one was. They have a right to their preferences. They have chosen to ignore or accept the provocations and aggressions upon them and to take their chances on worse developments of the same nature. Their course surprised us, but it lay within their privilege.

No definite explanation of it could be entirely trustworthy. We don't doubt that one factor in it was the usual swelling of the great State pay rolls in and about the city. In times as hard as these that sort of thing counts even more than at ordinary seasons.

We suppose, also, that the lop-sided, totally unchecked, and therefore entirely misleading, inquisition conducted by Mr. LONG con-

tributed considerably to the result. We think it very likely that a great many uncritical voters were influenced by it.

Another factor to which we should assign much effect was LONG's incessant insistence that the pending constitutional amendments, the $2,000 homestead exemption, and the like were an issue in this campaign. Of course, they were not. But the uninformed and credulous were evidently affected by this consideration.

Those points were not systematically met and persistently controverted by the city organization. The city organization, in fact, showed little talent in most other directions in meeting the assaults upon it.

The net result was that each of the four Long candidates pulled through with a small city majority. We say nothing of the majorities in the rigidly regimented suburban parishes, because their vote was for the statehouse machine, fully anticipated by all informed observers. The striking factor was the margin the Long candidates got in the city, small though it was in some cases.

This phase of the case must have astonished most observers in detail as well as in general. It was remarkable that any of them got a city majority at all. And it is noteworthy that the organization candidates who were expected to make the best city showing fell behind the others.

Judge Gleason and Commissioner Williams were commonly expected to get the largest margins because their districts included all the city precincts. But, as a matter of fact, a majority of 2,605 was counted against one of them and 1,418 against the other.

The organization counted confidently on landing Mr. Racivitch against Congressman FERNANDEZ in the downtown wards by a handsome majority. But one of the largest of the city majorities was recorded against Racivitch—about 2,800.

It seemed for some reason to be the general impression on both sides of the fence that Mr. Blancand, in the uptown district, was in for the hardest bumping. Yet in spite of this Mr. MALONEY's city majority against him was the smallest recorded—only 60.

As a whole the election was a strange reversal of form.

Mr. Speaker, I say that the gentleman is unnecessarily alarmed.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. BLANTON. When the gentleman has been so ably representing himself, and has the ability to represent himself in the elections, if he had not had the endorsement of the powers that be down there, could he have been elected?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. No. I am frank to say that unless I had the support of one organization or the other in Louisiana I would not have been elected.

Mr. BLANTON. If the gentleman had been against what was known as the "Long machine", would he have been reelected?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I am frank to say I could not have been, because the people are with Senator LONG.

Mr. TRUAX. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. TRUAX. The so-called "Long machine", I believe, stands for a redistribution of wealth?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Yes; and is generally known throughout the United States.

Mr. TRUAX. I wonder if the gentleman can answer whether that had anything to do with the popularity of the Senator?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Of course. We did organize these share-the-wealth societies, but I will talk to the gentleman in the cloakroom how those things are done and it might help him back in his district.

Mr. Speaker, I believe these issues ought to be fought out in Louisiana. May I give some election returns, not in New Orleans but in north Louisiana and in central Louisiana, in an election just 4 months ago? Talk about a rebellion! Talk about constitutional government! I believe in a majority vote. Nobody is prevented from going to register; nobody is prevented from voting. Every citizen who wanted to vote had the opportunity.

Look at these returns, and I will take in some of the territory represented by some of the gentlemen here in Congress who do not agree with me with reference to political matters in Louisiana, but I am happy to say we all agree on policies of national consequence. We all follow the Democratic leadership.

This is in reference to the election of September 11: "Long candidate overwhelmingly elected in Louisiana for supreme court justice." In the district of the supreme court justice who was elected in September is embraced the whole of the city of New Orleans and the parishes of St. Bernard, Jefferson, and Plaquemines. We elected a railroad commission besides, which took in the parishes of St. James, St. John the Baptist, and St. Charles. Our candidate was overwhelmingly elected. We went away from New Orleans. We had a special election. I think it was in October or November. A little farther up in the State and away from New Orleans the first supreme court district comprises the parishes of Rapides, Grant, Avoyelles, Lafayette, Evangeline, Allen, Beauregard, Jefferson Davis, Calcasieu, Cameron, and Acadia. In north Louisiana, central Louisiana, and south Louisiana the candidates endorsed by the Long organization were swept into office.

Let me refer to my distinguished colleague's own district. The judge that he and his friends supported was defeated and the Long candidate elected. You cannot controvert the record. Those parishes, Mr. Speaker, embracing the supreme court district, are in part of the congressional district of my colleagues, Mr. DE ROUEN, Mr. DEAR, and Mr. MONTET.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a newspaper report of the Universal Service, dated August 24, saying that the President does not believe that the activities of Senator LONG and his followers justify interference by the Federal Government.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I object to any more newspaper articles being inserted in the RECORD at this time.

Mr. BLANTON. Regardless of what we may think about the Louisiana situation, we are nevertheless personal friends of our colleague JOE FERNANDEZ. Why does not the gentleman allow him to put in his complete reply, which is only fair?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman has a number of newspaper articles, and it is my duty to try to preserve the integrity of the RECORD.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. This is the last one, and I just wanted to follow up and prove what I have been stating.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, if the gentleman will permit, I feel rather strenuously opposed to inserting such articles in the RECORD, but in a matter of this kind, where there seems to be such extreme feeling, all of them ought to have opportunity to put their matter in the RECORD, and I hope the gentleman will not object.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I am not trying to interfere with the gentleman in this particular case, but my remarks have reference to all newspaper articles. I withdraw my objection in this instance.

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

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

[From the New Orleans Times-Picayune, Aug. 25, 1934]

ROOSEVELT PLANS NO INTERFERENCE IN STATE AFFAIRS—PRESIDENT UNWILLING TO INTERVENE IN LOUISIANA SITUATION

By Universal Service

WASHINGTON, August 24.—President Roosevelt does not believe the activities of Senator HUEY LONG and his followers in Louisiana justify interference by the Federal Government, he explained today.

The Chief Executive feels the United States has a right to step in when it is proved conclusively that the constitutional right of free franchise has been violated. He pointed out that a municipality is a creature of the State and the latter may prescribe any form of government for a city that it may wish.

By the Associated Press

BATON ROUGE, LA., August 24.—Informed that President Roosevelt planned no interference in the political war raging in Louisiana, Senator HUEY P. LONG tonight commended the President for his stand and then continued to grind his ax for the official head of Mayor T. Semmes Walmsley, of New Orleans, whom the kingfish has sworn to oust from politics.

President Roosevelt said in his Washington press conference he saw no reason for Federal interference in the bitter struggle now current between Senator LONG and Mayor Walmsley over elections and political supremacy in New Orleans, where the machines of the two Louisiana leaders are working behind armed forces.

"Roosevelt knows his business", said LONG. "He's no damned fool. I'm that way about the Federal Government. He's running it and I haven't bothered him in that."

[From the United States Daily, Aug. 27, 1934]

The President, going into detail in explaining the attitude of the Government in regard to the situation in the State of Louisiana, where he pointed out that the Federal Government could not interfere with a State legislature's treatment of a municipality and only in the case of interference with the franchise of the people of the State, of which there had been no evidence, could Washington step into the preserves of the "Kingfish."

For a full half hour the men stood while the President talked, answered questions, and suggested topics himself, with all of the zest and good humor that characterized his most affable conferences. Pencils were busy right up to the concluding: "Thank you."

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I want to say to my distinguished friend that I was simply trying to prove up my remarks, and this is the only way I can hope to convince the House that my statements are correct and that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. SANDERS] is unnecessarily alarmed over conditions in the city of Baton Rouge and in the State.

I have no further desire, Mr. Speaker, to wash our political linen up here any further; but I may say, Mr. Speaker, that my head may waver and my feet may falter, but never shall I do anything against the honor or glory of the fair State of Louisiana for my own political advancement or aggrandizement. [Applause.]

TREASURY AND POST OFFICE DEPARTMENTS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1936

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 4442, the Treasury and Post Office Departments appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. BULWINKLE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Bureau of Accounts, $92,380.

Mr. HILL of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the chairman of the committee a question.

The chairman of the committee is doubtless aware of the fact that there are quite a few new rural routes and rural-route extensions that have been approved by the Post Office Department and that the Department would like to put into effect, but have not been able to do so on account of a lack of funds. I should like to ask the chairman of the committee whether or not the committee has considered this matter of new rural routes and the extension of old routes, and what the purposes and thoughts of the chairman are with reference to additional funds so that the new rural routes may be established and these extensions provided for.

Mr. ARNOLD. May I say to the gentleman from Alabama that when we reach that paragraph of the bill a committee amendment will be offered to take care of all the extensions and all the new routes that have been approved, with some leeway for additional routes and extensions.

Mr. HILL of Alabama. In other words, all new routes that the Department now desires to establish and all extensions that the Department wishes to put into effect will be taken care of by the necessary funds, and, in addition thereto, the amendment will carry sufficient money so that the Department can make other extensions and, if need be, create some new routes. Is that correct?

Mr. ARNOLD. That is true. This will take care of all the approved routes and extensions.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit, is it not a fact that since the Department has abolished so many routes and made so many consolidations they have reduced the number of rural carriers in the United States from 45,000 to 37,000, and does the gentleman think it is necessary for any additional appropriations to be made for the extension of the routes that have been consolidated and extended?

Mr. ARNOLD. Yes; it is necessary to use some additional funds for that purpose.

Mr. WOOD. Is it not a fact that through the consolidation and extension of these routes they have reduced the number of rural carriers from 45,000 to some 37,000?

Mr. ARNOLD. There has been quite a reduction, but there is no money available under the 1935 appropriation bill, except a very small amount to carry out the new routes that have already been approved and the extensions that have already been approved by the Department, and the purpose of the amendment that I shall offer will be to enable the Post Office Department to establish these new routes and make the necessary extensions.

Mr. WOOD. Does the gentleman mean an extension that is occasioned by the consolidation of two or more routes?

Mr. ARNOLD. Any extensions of existing routes. Some of them, of course, arise by reason of consolidations and some of them do not.

Mr. FORD of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, has the gentleman's committee any information about the amount it will propose as an amendment for the purpose of carrying out these extensions?

Mr. ARNOLD. I may say to the gentleman that will be taken up when we reach that section of the bill. There is a paragraph specifically applying to rural carriers and when we reach that paragraph the amendment will be offered.

The Clerk read as follows:

Clerks, first- and second-class post offices: For compensation to clerks and employees at first- and second-class post offices, including auxiliary clerk hire at summer and winter post offices, printers, mechanics, skilled laborers, watchmen, messengers, laborers, and substitutes, $162,000,000.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MEAD: Page 50, line 14, strike out "$162,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$163,000,000."

Mr. MEAD. Mr. Chairman, let me say, in explanation of the amendment I have just offered, that the appropriation included in the bill is $162,000,000, as against last year's appropriation of $146,500,000, which was later increased to $163,491,078 to take care of partial-pay restorations and promotions. This year's appropriation will not allow sufficient money for filling approximately 700 clerical vacancies which now exist, and which the Department would be justified in filling at this time. If the appropriation is increased a million dollars, it will permit the filling of these vacancies and provide proper pay for these substitutes as contemplated in the law. It will give better service to the public also. In the President's Budget message, on page 675, the estimated expenditures for 1936 are $170,950,000; but this bill provides only $162,000,000. The reason for this saving to a large degree can be found in the practice of the Department, a practice forced upon the Department either by the Budget or by reduced appropriation. This is the practice of working substitutes as regulars in the Postal Service and classifying them as substitutes. They have approximately 700 clerks filling regular positions, working 8 hours a day, at positions that cannot be vacated; they are paying those men substitute pay, although they have been working as regulars in some instances for a year or more, and have been classified as substitutes for as long as 8 or 9 years. I say that is a subterfuge; it is contrary to the spirit of the law to continue men on the roll of substitutes after they have been filling positions formerly held by regulars in the service. If these substitutes were actually substitutes, then this appropriation would be reasonable; but because these substitutes are actually regulars and the Department is paying them but $1,400 a year, when they are entitled to a promotion to at least the lower-grade pay of regulars of $1,700, it is an unfair, unjust, and unwarranted economy. We ought to stop this practice. If we do not stop it this year, we will have to stop it next year, when the number will be increased. We cannot make a saving by expecting men to work year after year in the role of substitutes at $1,400 a year, when they are actually working as regulars, and they never will be substitutes again. They ought to be appointed to the regular roll and given at

least $1,700 a year, the pay of the regular in the lowest grade. It is unjustifiable and unreasonable.

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

Mr. MEAD. Yes; I yield.

Mr. CONNERY. Do I understand from this that the substitutes are being put into regular positions, doing the regular work and being paid the substitute pay?

Mr. MEAD. Denied appointments; that is just what has occurred. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. CONNERY. And the gentleman is offering an amendment to take care of that?

Mr. MEAD. This amendment will at least give the Department a sufficient amount of money to take care of them if the Department wills to do so. At the hearings on this particular item this practice was brought to the attention of a representative of the Department, and here was the answer he gave:

We call that "holding vacancies."

In other words, denying promotion where it is due.

That is where we have not certified that we have dropped those places. We hold them because we feel that the vacancies will have to be filled. We could have regular men in those places. We have substitutes employed regularly for 8 hours.

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

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York increases this appropriation $1,000,000. Provision is made in the amount carried in the bill for filling something like 610 vacancies. An effort has been made, of course, on the part of the Post Office Department to run the business of the Department as economically as possible and at the same time do full and complete justice to the employees. From the report that comes to us through the hearings, with the filling of these additional vacancies, which the amount of money that is provided in the bill will fill, there is no reason why $1,000,000 should be added to this amount. We are carrying a recommendation in this bill just as it came to us from the Bureau of the Budget. They say that will handle the situation satisfactorily, and I insist that this amendment be voted down, and I further insist that the amount of money that we are carrying in this provision will handle the situation adequately.

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

Mr. ARNOLD. Yes.

Mr. CONNERY. The gentleman said that these are the exact figures demanded by the Bureau of the Budget. The gentleman from New York [Mr. MEAD] in his explanation said the Post Office Department had demanded this million dollars from the Budget, and we all know that the Postmaster General, Mr. Farley, has been striving for economy. If in his striving for economy he realizes the necessity for $1,000,000 more, certainly the Budget should have given the Appropriations Committee that million dollars more.

Mr. ARNOLD. Of course, I do not know about that part of it. I do know the recommendation the Department made for the Budget. The Budget comes here as the recommendation of the President. The Budget thoroughly investigated the matter, and after that they made the recommendation as to the amount of money they thought necessary for this particular service. That was approved by the President of the United States, and we are carrying it in the full amount approved by the Budget.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARNOLD. I yield.

Mr. BLANTON. The Budget is the financial agent of the President to carry out the President's wishes.

Mr. CONNERY. The President has a lot of things on his mind, and if the President was convinced that men were doing regular work at a substitute pay his recommendation might have been different.

Mr. BLANTON. The Postmaster General is close to the President, and the Budget is the President's agent, and I am sure the Postmaster General would not have any trouble in getting approved all the funds he needs.

Mr. CONNERY. I do not think he is so close. He asked for this increased amount, and they did not give it to him.

Mr. MEAD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARNOLD. I yield.

Mr. MEAD. In the President's budgetary message it shows that they ask for $170,950,000 and they gave $162,000,000. I want to say that I talked this over with the Post Office Department today, and they will not be able to appoint one of these men with this reduced appropriation. They will not be able to fill one vacancy, but will continue the practice of using substitutes in regular work for $1,400 a year.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, this appropriation calls for $162,000,000, an increase of approximately fourteen and one-half million dollars. Now, the total number under the 30-year retirement clause of June 1933 of clerks in the second-class offices, which this item is supposed to cover, has been 1,691. The average retirement for a year runs approximately to 1,100.

Without another dollar every substitute who has been listed any length of time will be taken care of as the result of this appropriation. I do not believe it is necessary in order to take care of the substitutes that this be added to. I believe they will have plenty of money to get along in a decent shape and do the work of the Department with $162,000,000, and I hope that the position of the Budget will be sustained.

Mr. LUDLOW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. LUDLOW. On page 38 of the hearings Mr. Burke, a representative of the Post Office Department, says: "We are asking for $162,000,000." I think all of us want to be just to the substitutes. I know they have a hard lot and I have fought consistently for them, and we have put in this bill $15,500,000 more for these employees than was carried last year.

Mr. CONNERY. I am informed by my colleague from California that they have laid off old men doing messenger work and put substitutes in their place.

Mr. TABER. The regular pay for a messenger is on a different scale, and if they are putting in substitutes as messengers they are probably carrying them along at about the same rate. There is no point in breaking up this situation and the action of the Budget in order to take care of the messengers. They are not supposed to be carried in the same grade as clerks.

Mr. CONNERY. The fact remains that not a single regular can be appointed unless this appropriation goes through?

Mr. TABER. Yes; they can. There are many of them who will be appointed. We were told that a large number of the substitutes would be cleared up by this situation.

Mr. BLANTON. Who ought to know more about this than Mr. Burke, who appeared for the Department and asked for $162,000,000 and got exactly that sum?

Mr. TABER. It seems to me we are going just as far as we ought to go, because I do not think there is any question but what the substitutes of long service, who have been hanging on for 6 or 7 years, will be pretty generally taken care of. I do not see any reason for permitting the substitutes who have only just come on to be made regulars on account of sympathy, because they should learn their business first, as the others did.

Mr. MEAD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. MEAD. The gentleman from New York made a statement a moment ago about natural retirements and the filling of vacancies; but does the gentleman remember that as a result of the economy bill we involuntarily forced out of service thousands of men who were only 30 years in the service, and we have boiled the personnel down to the minimum? Therefore, we cannot contemplate additional retirements of any great degree in the future.

Mr. TABER. The retirements were made not under the Economy Act but under an appropriation bill that was passed along about the 1st of June 1933. Those 30-year retirements have been made and practically all cleaned up. They were supposed to do that only in cases where the Department did not need to fill a vacancy. I do not believe

that they were intended to interfere with or did interfere in any way with the regular operations, where there was plenty of work to keep the clerks employed who were then on the roll. There will be normal retirements of somewhere around a thousand this year, and those vacancies can be filled, and the substitutes who have been waiting a long time can be made regulars.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. McLEOD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I simply want to call the attention of the House to some of the testimony before the committee in regard to the question under discussion. In that regard I should like to ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. MEAD] what would be the average pay for a substitute working 8 hours a day at 65 cents an hour?

Mr. MEAD. It would be $1,400 or $1,450 a year.

Mr. McLEOD. And is it not a fact that the testimony before the Appropriations Committee on the Post Office Department brought out the fact that in most instances substitute employees were 100 percent employed but received only the salary of substitute employees?

Mr. MEAD. Yes; and Mr. Burke, if you will refer to page 56 of the hearings, in answer to a question asked by the gentleman from Michigan, said:

> Yes. He is working 8 hours per day out of a scheduled 10 hours. We feel in all cases where we have a full-time job for a man, 8 hours per day out of a scheduled 10 hours, we should, if possible, make him a regular carrier, instead of continuing him as a substitute.

And then when you asked him if he will have any left after he makes a few promotions which he contemplated, he said:

> Yes; there will be still 700.

I say to you that there is no possibility of promoting all those men with the appropriation we are making available.

Mr. ARNOLD. Will the gentleman yield for just a moment?

Mr. McLEOD. I yield.

Mr. ARNOLD. Permit me to say that we have a normal turnover in this service of something like 2,000 a year. With that normal turnover of 2,000 it will permit these substitutes to come in.

Mr. MEAD. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. McLEOD. Yes; I yield.

Mr. MEAD. We cannot expect a normal turnover in the Post Office Department for the next 5 years, for the reason that we eliminated all surplus employees that we possibly could under the retirement plan, and every post office in every city in the United States was given instructions by the Department to weed out all aged employees, who under natural law would not be retired for 5 or 10 years.

Mr. McLEOD. Let me say to the gentleman, in walking over to the House Office Building this morning with a Member of Congress, he cited the case of an individual who graduated from high school with him 17 years ago, who went on the substitute rolls of the Post Office Department, and is still on the substitute rolls even though his record is 100-percent efficient. This individual is still receiving an average of $1,400, where he should receive at least the minimum of a regular.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLEOD. I yield.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Is it not a fact that there are thousands of substitutes today who have been on the substitute rolls for 5 or 6 years?

Mr. McLEOD. Oh, longer than that. Moreover, the substitutes in the larger post-office areas cannot obtain other employment while they maintain the status of a substitute carrier.

Mr. Burke testified in the hearings, at page 36, as follows:

> Substitutes at practically all offices have plenty of work. In fact, we are getting complaints from some offices that the substitutes have too much work.

Meaning that they are working the maximum number of hours and receiving the minimum pay. That, of course, is contrary to the whole set-up of this so-called "program of uplift and assistance" to deserving individuals who are attempting to get along and who are loyal employees or servants of the Federal Government.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW], a member of the committee, has read to you from the hearings a statement by Mr. Burke that he has only asked for $162,000,000. That is exactly the amount that this committee gave him.

Where is there a man in this Government service who is more efficient and more conversant with the needs of this Department than Mr. Vincent Burke? He is one of the finest public officials there is in the Government today. He knows exactly everything about the needs and necessities of that Department. Who ought to know more about it, he and the committee or somebody who is not on the committee? Who ought to know more about it, the distinguished gentleman who is chairman of this committee and the members of that committee, who held the hearings and have voted this bill out and who marked it up after conducting the hearings, or someone not on the committee?

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

Mr. BLANTON. I yield.

Mr. ARNOLD. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the amount we carry in this bill will give $15,500,000 more than they have for the current fiscal year.

Mr. BLANTON. Certainly. Attention was called to that by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]. It is more than the appropriation for the fiscal year by $15,500,000.

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

Mr. BLANTON. I yield.

Mr. CONNERY. The gentleman spoke about Vincent Burke. I agree entirely with the gentleman that there is not a finer or abler man; and, by the same token——

Mr. BLANTON. If the gentleman admits that, then he admits himself out of court.

Mr. CONNERY. By the same token there is not a brighter man in the United States Government; and he is so bright that he knows that when the Bureau of the Budget asks for $162,000,000 that it would be very bad taste on his part to ask the Appropriations Committee for more, even though he knew the Post Office Department ought to get it.

Mr. BLANTON. Now, my good friend from Massachusetts says he is in favor of Vincent Burke. Then follow his recommendations.

Our good friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. MEAD] is the close personal friend of every postal clerk and city letter carrier in the United States, he is the close personal friend of every rural carrier in the United States, he is the close personal friend of every railway mail clerk and of every substitute in every post office in the United States, and he is their personal spokesman here on this floor to fight their battles for them. They expect him to do it and we expect him to do it. And we are their true and tried friends also. But, granting all that, we must stand by these committees, we must stand by the President, we must stand by the Budget, if we expect to keep this Government out of bankruptcy.

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

Mr. BLANTON. I yield.

Mr. MEAD. Of course, the gentleman must have in mind that the mere making available of this money does not necessarily imply its expenditure. The gentleman knows the Department will not spend it improperly.

Mr. BLANTON. My friend the gentleman from New York knows that if the occasion does not arise to expend it for the purpose intended that it will be used for promotions, promotions that Congressmen will go down there and insist be made; I imagine my friend from New York would be just as insistent down there as any of the rest of us—and he has a powerful influence down there—would be just as insistent for promotions, and they may be undeserved, and I do not say this in any unkind way; I do lots of things for my friends

that possibly I ought not to do, and they do things for me that possibly they ought not to do. Friendship leads us to do lots of things, but we must stand by our committee.

We must back our committee, who held these hearings and worked long before Congress assembled. The Committee on Appropriations started holding hearings on some bills in the month of December and were away from home during the Christmas holidays in order to do so. We must back up the President and keep the finances of this Government within the President's financial program.

There is no more loyal American than my friend from Massachusetts [Mr. CONNERY], and I know he is going to back his President and his President's Budget.

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

Mr. BLANTON. I yield.

Mr. MAY. The gentleman from Texas has spoken very highly of Vincent Burke. I rose simply to call attention to the fact that Mr. Burke is a Kentuckian.

Mr. BLANTON. That is one of his numerous virtues I failed to mention.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HOEPPEL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, the doctrine advanced here by the distinguished gentleman from Texas that we should follow the directions of the President and the Director of the Budget in instances of this kind certainly will not receive my approval. I am not interested in what the President or the Director of the Budget submits to me, if such is contrary to the welfare of our postal employees and other workers. I know that in my district substitutes are being employed 9, 10, 11, and even 12 hours a day, yet the Department will not appoint these men to regular positions because of the fact that if it did they would receive the regular salary and be employed according to the 8-and-10 law. I do not approve of enslaving our substitutes by making them work long hours and curtailing their pay in the name of economy in order that the Post Office Department may show a saving in its administration. The same condition prevails in the Railway Mail Service. I have personal friends who have been substitutes for years and who are not appointed to existing regular vacancies because the Department apparently desires to economize. I think it is high time we provided sufficient funds for the Post Office Department to pay these men the rate they should be paid.

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

Mr. HOEPPEL. I yield.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman says he is not interested in what the President sends us.

Mr. HOEPPEL. I am not interested in what the President sends, if, in my opinion, it is not in the interest of the people.

Mr. BLANTON. Is not the gentleman interested in what the President wants?

Mr. HOEPPEL. I am interested in my people and what they want.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman is interested in this $24,000,000,000 Townsend scheme and this other hooey scheme for the redistribution of the wealth that is now fooling so many people in the country.

Mr. HOEPPEL. If we enact the Townsend pensions, instead of the insignificant $30 a month which the Director of the Budget has submitted to us, we will find it is not "hooey."

Mr. BLANTON. Is the gentleman going to join hands with a $24,000,000,000 organization which states it will cause a revolution and wreck the Government unless it has its say?

Mr. MEAD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOEPPEL. I yield to my friend from New York.

Mr. MEAD. I may say, Mr. Chairman, that Mr. Burke has been brought into this discussion by others rather than by me; but inasmuch as he has been lauded very highly, I call him as a witness. With regard to vacancies in the carrier service only, the following testimony appears at page 56 of the hearings on the Post Office Department section of the bill:

Mr. ARNOLD. How many of these 995 vacancies will you be able to take care of?

Mr. BURKE. Of these 995 vacancies on December 16, we are approving the appointment of about 280 as regulars.

Mr. HOWES. And we will approve more as the necessity comes up.

Mr. MCLEOD. There will still be 700.

It is these 700 I am pleading for. They have been serving as substitutes for 1 year, 2 years, 3 years, and up to 10 and 12 years; and they ought to be given the honest pay they are earning.

Mr. HOEPPEL. I agree with the gentleman from New York. The cases I mentioned are personally known to me, and these men are entitled to permanent employment instead of substitute work. Vacancies exist due to retirement and death; but despite the fact that vacancies exist, the Post Office Department will not fill them.

Mr. LUDLOW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOEPPEL. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. LUDLOW. The part of the bill to which the gentleman from New York addressed himself is not before the House at all.

Mr. MEAD. The same situation occurs in connection with the clerical force and the carrier force.

Mr. HOEPPEL. While I have the time, I should like to call attention to a further fact. We are not giving our post-office employees the consideration that we should, so far as appointments are concerned. We are very prolific and free in the appointment of men to offices here in the various emergency bureaus, and they sit around in these facilities, doing little or nothing. They do not know what it is all about, yet they continue to draw fabulous salaries. If we are going to economize, let us begin with the patronage profiteers in Washington.

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOEPPEL. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SCHNEIDER. While we are economizing in connection with the expenses of these employees who are entitled to promotion, we are very liberal in this bill a little further on in a contribution of some $29,000,000 as a subsidy to the shipping interests. If we want to economize, we ought to economize by cutting down these colossal sums which we are giving to the shipping interests.

Mr. HOEPPEL. I regret that I cannot agree with the gentleman. I am in favor of subsidies to our American-owned shipping interests as a matter of national defense.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is a very important matter, and as was well stated by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SCHNEIDER] just now, it does not seem to me it is good economy to economize at the expense of men who are giving a loyal service to the Government. It is also un-American to ask a man to work as a regular for a substitute's pay. That is like making an officer out of a man and paying him a private's pay. It is all wrong.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. MEAD] said, in connection with the carrier force, that they were putting 280 of the substitutes to work and leaving 700 men who have been going along as substitutes for years in many instances in the same position. You know these men and I know them. Every one of you know them in your post offices in your home cities. You know the work they do and the hours they keep. If it is a carrier, he is out in the snow, rain, and sleet. He gets the mail to you on time and you kick if it does not arrive on time. These men are giving a loyal service to the United States Government.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] spoke about Mr. Burke coming before the Appropriations Committee and asking for the one hundred and sixty-two million and no more. If I am not mistaken, Mr. Chairman, there is a regulation in effect in all the departments which forbids an official of the department coming before the Appropriations Committee and asking for a higher figure than that given by the Budget; so, of course, Mr. Burke when he came in, no matter what was in his heart, no matter how he felt toward these men, no matter what the necessity was for rais-

ing the appropriation, could not say to the Appropriations Committee that it should increase the appropriation a million dollars.

There is no such restriction, however, upon Members of the Congress, so the gentleman from New York [Mr. MEAD] can say it, I can say it, and every other Member here can say it.

Mr. DONDERO. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. DONDERO. Do not the substitute carriers do the work of the regular carriers?

Mr. CONNERY. Yes.

Mr. DONDERO. Why should they not receive the same salary?

Mr. CONNERY. They should. They only get fourteen forty instead of the regular pay.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNERY. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. How about adding this million dollars to these people who are doing a good work and taking it off of the $39,000,000 which has been allotted to the shipping subsidies in future sections of the bill?

Mr. CONNERY. I have not discussed the ship-subsidy feature of this bill, but I remember a distinguished Senator from Washington on the floor of the United States Senate 2 years ago bringing out the fact that it cost $110,000 to carry 1 pound of mail under one of these ship subsidies. This has not anything to do with the present administration. That was an act of a past administration. Of course, I am not in favor of any such subsidy as that.

May I say especially to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] that that was started by the Republican administration and the Democratic administration is doing away with that kind of graft.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONNERY] knows that I am just as much against all subsidies as he is. I have as many postal employees in my district as any other Member. I am their friend. However, I am here to tell you that, comparably, they are paid as well as any other employees in the State of Texas, and the people whom they serve are becoming alarmed about their pay being above what other people get for a comparable service. You might go too far in their behalf and create a prejudice against them. Do not do for them so much that you will create a prejudice against them in the hearts and minds of the people whom they serve.

Mr. CONNERY. May I say to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON]—and this is an old argument between the gentleman from Texas and myself—that I am striving—and I hope the gentleman from Texas will strive—to bring the wages in industry in Texas up to the wages in Massachusetts.

Mr. BLANTON. Down in Texas we do not believe in working just 30 hours a week. We believe in doing a good, honest day's work.

Mr. CONNERY. That is what we do in Massachusetts; but we want decent pay, and not the wages which are paid in Texas.

Mr. MEAD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNERY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MEAD. We are not providing one dollar for the payment of any substitute who is doing a substitute's work. We are providing ample money for the Department to take care of the substitutes who are appointed regularly.

Mr. CONNERY. I hope the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MEAD] will be agreed to.

[Here the gavel fell.]

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

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MEAD and Mr. CONNERY) there were—ayes 97, noes 14.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

City delivery carriers: For pay of letter carriers, City Delivery Service, $116,750,000.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I am particularly interested in the paragraph referring to the village carrier, and I should like to know what the differential in pay is between the city carrier and the village carrier.

Mr. MEAD. A village carrier receives $1,250 or $1,350, I believe it is, and a city carrier, in the lower grade, receives $1,700 and advances automatically each year $100 in salary until he attains the maximum of $2,100.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. The village carrier does practically the same character of work as a city carrier, does he not?

Mr. MEAD. There is a difference. Some years ago we had a special bill passed that permitted carrier service in small villages that could not qualify for city delivery service by reason of population.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. I understand that, but the village carriers do the same service and work the same number of hours.

Mr. MEAD. It is practically the same service, but, of course, if the cost of village delivery service were increased, I fear there would be a tendency on the part of the Department to refrain from giving this service to the villages.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. But, certainly, there is not such a sufficient difference in their work to justify such a large differential in salary.

Mr. MEAD. Last year the House passed a bill with respect to the village carriers increasing them $150 a year and that bill died in the Senate.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. I thank the gentleman for his information.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MEAD: Page 51, line 15, after the word "service", strike out "$116,750,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$117,750,000."

Mr. MEAD. Mr. Chairman, this is a similar amendment to the one I offered on page 50 of the bill. This amendment pertains to the carrier force in the City Delivery Service; the amendment we adopted a moment ago applies to the clerical force in first- and second-class offices.

This will permit the Department to pay substitutes who are performing regular duty the salary prescribed for a regular carrier. It will in no wise help the substitute who is not working as a regular, although the substitute is called upon to furnish his own uniform, to show up two or three times a day at the post office, to study the scheme plan, and to become familiar with postal rules and regulations, for which he receives no pay whatsoever.

This will permit the Department, when its judgment so decrees, to pay substitutes who are working as regular carriers the pay prescribed for such work for regular carriers. There are approximately 600 who will not be taken care of unless we provide the money for the Department. In view of the fact we have just made it possible to take care of the substitutes in the clerical force, I can see no reason why the committee should not accept this amendment, in order that we may take care of the substitutes in the carrier force.

This will call for no additional expenditure except to pay a substitute, when he is performing the duties of a regular employee, the minimum wage prescribed by law for that particular task.

This is an honest amendment. It is not a subterfuge to save money on the poorest and most pathetic class in the Federal service. [Applause.]

We treated the substitutes in the Postal Service miserably when we enacted the economy bill. We denied them the right to work, because in the economy bill we held that all the money saved by reason of retirement, resignation, sick leave, or absence from duty on the part of the regulars must be impounded in the Treasury. Therefore, the substitutes were unable to work.

Furthermore, any employee of this Department that was a veteran, who served his country in the World War and was

disabled, had his compensation reduced because he was employed by the Federal Government—a most unjust act.

So we found the substitutes denied charity by the various public-relief agencies because they were working for Uncle Sam, denied work in the post offices because the money had to be saved, and denied compensation because they were supposed to have a Federal job.

Mr. Chairman, I am ashamed of the treatment we accorded the postal substitutes, and here is our opportunity to be on the square with them. [Applause.]

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

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. COCHRAN. Is it not true there are substitutes on the list today who have been substitutes for 5 or 6 or 7 or 8 years?

Mr. MEAD. Yes; there are substitutes who have been there for 10 or 12 years, and some of them made as little as $1.50 a week. I am not pleading for them in this amendment, much as I should like to do so; I am only asking that the substitute, once he is appointed regular, be given the salary of a regular carrier.

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

Mr. MEAD. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SWEENEY. Is it not true that this will affect 30,000 substitutes, approximately?

Mr. MEAD. This will permit of the promotion of six-hundred-and-some-odd substitutes who, unless this money is provided, will have to work as regulars for $1,400 a year. In a way it will help the entire substitute group.

Mr. SWEENEY. In the aggregate, how many of them are there?

Mr. MEAD. There may be 25,000 substitutes in all the service, but this particular amendment only applies to substitutes in the city letter-carrier service.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Chairman, in this item we are carrying this year $12,750,000 more than was carried for this purpose in 1935. There has been a turnover in this service of something like a thousand. This will enable the filling of these places and promote these men whom the gentleman from New York and all of us is so much interested in.

There are 995 vacancies that will be taken care of. Of these vacancies, 280 have been already taken care of.

I am as much in sympathy with the postal employees as any man in this House. At the same time, while I want to do them justice, I want to protect the Treasury of the United States, and see at the same time that these men shall receive justice.

The gentleman from New York has asked for another million dollars over the amount recommended by the Bureau of the Budget and over the amount recommended by the President of the United States through the Budget. The committee added a million dollars to the amount carried in this bill a few months ago, and now another million is wanted. We must consider the Treasury of the United States. We must consider the recommendations of the President through his Bureau of the Budget in these matters.

These men that the gentleman from New York has been talking about should be well taken care of and will be better taken care of under this bill for 1936 to the extent of $12,750,000. With the vacancies to be filled and with the turn-over in the service the employees covered by this item will be taken care of by permanent employment very rapidly, and I ask that the Committee vote down this amendment.

Mr. CONNERY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARNOLD. I yield.

Mr. CONNERY. I read from the hearings. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARNOLD] asked:

> How many of these 995 vacancies will you be able to take care of?

Mr. Burke answered:

> Of these 995 vacancies on December 16 we are approving the appointment of about 280 as regulars.

Mr. ARNOLD. That is out of the 1935 appropriation. That will leave 705 to be taken care of out of this appropriation.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Burke says 280 will be taken care of, and that leaves 700.

Mr. ARNOLD. The 700 will be taken care of out of the 1936 appropriation and many more through the turn-over of employees in the service.

Mr. McLEOD. Mr. Chairman, I refer the gentleman to the hearings on page 56, and I quote from Mr. Burke's own testimony, a man who seems to have the confidence of the Membership of this House. We all have faith in him, and I quote Mr. Burke where he testified there are 995 vacancies and that 280 can be deducted from that number. The question was asked as to whether the substitutes were getting more money or less than the regulars. Mr. Burke replied that they are getting less and that their average salary is $1,400 or $1,450 as against $2,100, if they had the status of regulars.

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

Mr. McLEOD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, to complete my statement, which will merely be the insertion of the testimony of Mr. Burke in response to some questions that I asked him during the hearing on this bill. The substitute carrier is getting $1,400 to $1,450, as against $2,100, which he is entitled to, when he does the work of regular appointees. He said that there is some saving in money by this form of procedure, but that it causes some complaint and that there is considerable merit in the complaint on the part of the substitute.

> Mr. McLEOD. He does the work but does not get the pay?
>
> Mr. BURKE. Yes. He is working 8 hours per day out of a scheduled 10 hours. We feel that in all cases where we have a full-time job for a man, 8 hours per day out of a scheduled 10 hours, we should, if possible, make him a regular carrier, instead of continuing him as a substitute.
>
> Mr. McLEOD. Why not take care of that in this bill?
>
> Mr. BURKE. With the money that we are setting up here we will be able to take care of the meritorious cases.
>
> Mr. ARNOLD. How many of these 995 vacancies will you be able to take care of?
>
> Mr. BURKE. Of these 995 vacancies, on December 16 we are approving the appointment of about 280 as regulars.

Mr. DUFFEY of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLEOD. Yes.

Mr. DUFFEY of Ohio. In my district some of the substitutes are paid as low as $2.50 a month. Does not the gentleman believe that if an added million dollars is given to this appropriation, that is comparable with other millions of dollars that we have given for legitimate purposes in this Congress.

Mr. McLEOD. I want to repeat what Mr. MEAD said. It would be only right if we could properly take care of that group of people that the gentleman has in mind, but this does not affect those people in any large sense. This merely takes care of the individuals who are doing 8 hours a day and not getting the pay they are entitled to get. The substitutes who are not supplied with sufficient work to bring their work up to 8 hours a day are not helped by this amendment. They should receive more compensation, there is no question about that, because they are not permitted to take on other employment if they want to keep their Federal status. They are not permitted in some cities to take funds or assistance from the various welfare departments, and yet many of them are strictly entitled to welfare aid.

Mr. DUFFEY of Ohio. Do they not have to go to the post office early in the morning and wait around hoping that somebody will be at home sick?

Mr. McLEOD. They are supposed to report once a day.

Mr. HOEPPEL. If you pass this amendment, it will be possible for these substitutes who are working 9 or 10 or 11 hours a day to work only 8 hours a day, and in that same ratio you will be giving additional employment to other substitutes.

Mr. McLEOD. Yes; and that would be consistent with the codes advanced by the present administration. But this amendment is intended to give the substitute what he is entitled to for the work that he is doing. He is being denied his proper compensation.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment. It is all right to talk about adding a lot more money to this appropriation, but why should we give more than the Department specifically says it needs? Mr. Burke, representing the Postmaster General's office, said, on page 56 of the hearings:

We will take care of the meritorious cases among the vacancies.

And when he can do that, what earthly sense is there in our boosting this appropriation up into the sky just for the sake of making a gesture? We are supposed to sit here as the Congress of the United States and appropriate the funds necessary to run the Government and not throw away the people's money so that bureaucrats can go ahead and play with the money, regardless of the needs of government. Those who are promoting this amendment are in favor of turning a million dollars over to the bureaucrats, not to fill vacancies which exist but to provide funds for the bureaucrats to play with, without restraint, and I am opposed to that sort of program.

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

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman quoted Mr. Burke, who said that the money that this bill provides the Department with will take care of the meritorious cases. Then if we vote this extra million dollars, it will be to take care of the unmeritorious cases, will it not, as a logical conclusion?

Mr. TABER. Absolutely, and make the Department subject to political pressure.

Mr. BLANTON. And the money in this amendment will be for unmeritorious cases.

Mr. TABER. Absolutely. That is what it is for—not for the meritorious cases.

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

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. SCHNEIDER. I think the gentleman will not go so far as to say that the head of the Department would expend this money for employees who are not entitled to it? These substitute employees are entitled to promotion to any permanent position in case there is a vacancy, and they should have this pay. The question of meritorious employees does not enter into it. The civil-service regulations and the law establishing these positions require that the permanent positions be filled.

Mr. TABER. I cannot yield any further. The situation is just this: The number of clerks and carriers available in any office is dependent upon determination by the Department of the needs. When a department says they can take care of all meritorious cases and fill all vacancies that ought to be filled, they mean that they can fill all positions where there is need for them. Why do we want to put this million dollars up there to be played with?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words. I should like to get some information from the gentleman from New York [Mr. MEAD]. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARNOLD] stated that Mr. Burke said this would put 280 to work; that is, the present appropriation. I understood the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARNOLD] to say that this present appropriation, without the amendment which the gentleman from New York [Mr. MEAD] has offered, will take care of these 700.

Mr. ARNOLD. May I say to the gentleman that the 280 came on in December out of the 1935 appropriation. That was last December. They have already gone on.

Mr. CONNERY. Now, what about the 700?

Mr. ARNOLD. The 700 will be taken care of out of this appropriation that we are carrying in this bill.

Mr. CONNERY. I should like to hear what the gentleman from New York [Mr. MEAD] has to say about that.

Mr. MEAD. I cannot identify which one it is with regard to the hearings, but Mr. Burke said:

Of those 995 vacancies on December 16 we are approving the appointment of 280 regulars.

Then Mr. McLEOD said:

There will still be 700.

Mr. Burke answered:

We want to be careful to see that we are not falling into an extravagance by filling these vacancies. That is why it is a slow process.

Very slow. Sometimes it takes several years. Then he goes on to say that they will take care of additional meritorious cases, but he does not mention the fact that he can take care of these 700. I took the matter up with the Department, and I put these figures before them, and I say to the gentleman that the information I got, without mentioning any names, from authentic, reliable sources, is that they cannot take care of these 700 cases with this appropriation.

I want to say further to the gentleman there is not any need to be worried about extravagance, because everybody knows that they have been reducing their deliveries in business and residential sections. They have not only been doing that but they have been making every possible saving in the present Post Office administration, so much so that they have developed a surplus of $12,000,000. I am not willing for them to do that at the expense of the substitutes in the Postal Service. [Applause.]

Mr. ARNOLD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNERY. I yield.

Mr. ARNOLD. The gentleman from New York [Mr. MEAD] says this is confidential information. Presumably it comes from someone in the Department. The gentleman owes it to this House to tell us where that information comes from, so that we can judge something as to the merits of that position.

Mr. CONNERY. I do not think the gentleman is under any obligation to give the House any confidential information which he has.

Mr. ARNOLD. I think it is manifestly unfair to this committee and to this House if there are people in the Post Office Department who come to us and tell us one thing and then go to others and tell them something else.

Mr. CONNERY. I am sure the gentleman from New York [Mr. MEAD] will impart quietly to the gentleman from Illinois the information he has.

Mr. ARNOLD. It is not the gentleman from Illinois only who is interested. It is this House that is interested.

Mr. CONNERY. He can get it from the same person or persons from whom the gentleman from New York got it.

Mr. MEAD. I will tell the gentleman publicly. But as Chairman of the Post Office Committee I happen to know something about the operations of the Post Office Department. I took these matters up with Department representatives, who presented information to the committee of which the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARNOLD] is chairman. I quoted figures to them and received figures from them which, in my judgment, verify the statements that I have made.

Mr. ARNOLD. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CONNERY. I yield.

Mr. ARNOLD. I think, in fairness to the House and in fairness to the committee, the gentleman from New York should state the names of those people. If they are coming to us with one statement of facts and going around behind our backs to other people with a different statement of facts, we ought to know who they are. The Post Office Department ought to know who they are; and if anyone in that Department is giving out contradictory information, we should know who they are and the Department should know.

Mr. MEAD. The gentleman may be attempting to build up a straw man, and perhaps this may be an effort to draw a herring across the trail. I am pleading for the substitutes in the Post Office Department, and I am not going to be taken off the track by any statement about the activities of my committee or Department representatives. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONNERY] has expired.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CONNERY. I want to conclude my statement. First I will yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

Mr. BLANTON. No man on this floor is more interested than I am in seeing that all postal employees receive just treatment at our hands and that they are paid adequate salaries. And I believe that if you would submit the matter to your constituents back home they, by a large majority, would say that postal employees now are fairly treated and receive adequate pay.

When there are millions of men now in the United States who have no jobs at all and cannot get any work and have nothing with which to support their families, and Congress has voted $4,000,000,000 to help them get work, we are forced to look at this matter from the standpoint of 120,000,000 people. I believe that Mr. Burke in the Department has just as much interest in them as any man on this floor, and I believe he will look after them properly with the money which he has requested and which the committee has allowed him.

Mr. CONNERY. The gentleman knows, and I know, that Mr. Burke has all the interest anyone could have in the employees; he has their interests very much at heart because that is the type of man he is; but, I repeat, that Mr. Burke is under orders from the Post Office Department when he comes before the Appropriations Committee not to ask for a cent more than the Budget has allowed. Mr. Burke, deep down in his heart, must realize that the substitutes should not be put on as regulars and paid substitute pay. The gentleman from New York [Mr. MEAD] wants to put these substitutes on as regulars where they have been and pay them regular pay, which they should receive.

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

Mr. CONNERY. I yield.

Mr. McLEOD. In order to justify the stand the gentleman is taking, and to satisfy the gentleman from Texas in the question he has just asked, I quote the following from page 57 of the hearing:

> Mr. McLEOD. Would the money included here take care of more than the 280 you are approving?
>
> Mr. BURKE. Yes, sir.
>
> Mr. McLEOD. Then, if it becomes necessary to certify more than the 280, you will have money with which to do it?
>
> Mr. HOWES. We will have money to provide for some of it.

Mr. CONNERY. Some of it; only some of it; that is it. We want to take care of all of those 700 men whom they have been using on regular jobs but paying substitutes' pay. Let us pay a man a decent day's wage for a decent day's work. I hope the amendment is adopted.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I may say that no postal substitute has spoken to me; and I doubt very much whether any postal substitutes have spoken to any Member of the House about this amendment.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, I am very much gratified by the action of the House during the last few minutes. I am glad at last to see this display of independence on the part of this branch of the Congress. I think if the attitude exhibited here during the past half hour keeps on that in time we may be able to restore ourselves to something resembling a real legislative body. I do not know how it may impress others, but to me it is significant that in the amendment just adopted providing an additional million dollars for salaries of underpaid post-office clerks we have actually taken legislation into our own hands and have succeeded in passing it over objection of a bureau chief.

In my opinion, Mr. Chairman, we have been paying too much attention to bureaus and to the opinions of bureau chiefs and we have been putting entirely too much faith in the infallibility of the Budget. We all know that the Budget Bureau time after time has made mistakes, mistakes which it has been obliged afterward to admit. The trouble with the House has been that invariably it has supinely followed the recommendations of the Budget, even when it knew the Budget was wrong. And the Budget, I may say, has done some very wrong things. Just at the last session of Congress the Bureau of the Budget, in cooperation with the Department of Agriculture, attempted to take away from us or to drastically cut the appropriations of nearly all of the agricultural experiment stations of the country. We had to plead for days with the Appropriations Committee, and it was only after a long, hard fight, in which almost the whole country joined us, we were able to get those appropriations restored.

The Budget Bureau is by no means infallible. Its judgment certainly should not be law. Its opinion should carry weight with us, of course, but it is the business of this body to make the law.

Now, there are Members of the House who know a great deal more about some of the items in this bill than the bureau chiefs do or than the Budget makers do. I venture to say that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MEAD], the Chairman of the Post Office Committee of the House, knows more about the particular items in this bill upon which he is offering his amendments and upon which he is now giving us information than do either the Bureau of the Budget or the Post Office Department itself. [Applause.] And I think we should weigh well what he has to say while this bill is being considered and that we should begin now to pay a little attention to the opinions of our own Members and should cease to be influenced by departmental opinion.

In my estimation, the gentleman from New York is absolutely right. The substitute carriers deserve the small consideration which he is fighting now to give them. The amendment we have just adopted will enable the Post Office Department to fill 700 clerical vacancies which could not otherwise be filled, and which we all know ought to be filled. It will enable employees doing the work of regular clerks to receive the legitimate pay of regular clerks. The amendment now pending will do the same thing for 600 city letter carriers who have been working as regulars 8 hours a day for years, but who have been receiving substitutes' pay because during all those years neither the Post Office Department nor the Bureau of the Budget have seen fit to do them justice by providing enough money to pay them the regular and legal salary. I sincerely trust this amendment, like the preceding one, may be adopted. [Applause.]

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Railway postal clerks, travel allowance: For travel allowance to railway postal clerks and substitute railway postal clerks, $2,350,000.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. MEAD: On page 53, line 7, after the word "clerks", strike out "$2,350,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$3,250,000."

Mr. MEAD. Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment to take care of the travel pay of the employees in the Railway Mail Service. Up until the passage of the Economy Act the travel allowance of railway mail clerks was $3 per day for their lodging and meals. They had to be away from home 10 hours before they were entitled to travel pay. The economy bill, however, in an effort to penalize some employees more than others, not satisfied to deduct 15 percent from their pay, unwilling to agree that reducing their pay for night work on the trains by 50 percent was a sufficient toll for them to pay, not satisfied with denying them automatic promotions, went beyond reason, in my judgment, and reduced the travel allowance of these men from $3 to $2 a day.

The travel allowance of Members of Congress, of the Postmaster General, of supervisors in the various departments of the Government, has been restored to the full amount. It has been restored to all except the railway mail clerks, and in an effort to save a few dollars we are going to continue the penalty on them, force them when away from home to eat in soup kitchens, and stay perhaps in flop houses, places

certainly beneath the dignity of the men who work for the greatest and the richest Government on earth. But before I stand silently by and see this happen I will at least make an effort to be fair to these loyal clerks. [Applause.] I hope to see enough money provided so that if the Department wants to give them the $3-a-day travel allowance, it will be possible to do so.

If the administration is eager to do justice to these employees of the Railway Mail Service, a sufficient appropriation should be provided.

The law reads that the Postmaster General may provide a traveling allowance not in excess of $3 a day. The appropriation in the bill provides that under no circumstances, unless he be a miracle man, could he give them over $2 a day. I am only attempting, Mr. Chairman, to make this appropriation consistent with the law; and under the amendment I have offered the Postmaster General may or may not provide a decent pittance for these men when they are away from their homes. I ask you in a sense of justice and fair play to support this amendment, and I want you to know that we are not depriving the Department of any effort which they may make toward economy. We are only making it possible for them to be consistent with the law which the Congress of the United States enacted some years ago. If we do not adopt this amendment, we are treating these employees unfairly, for we have restored the travel allowance to the heads of departments, to the supervisors, and to the inspectors, and deny it to those who are given the lowest amount for travel allowance.

[Here the gavel fell.]

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

Mr. Chairman, may I say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MEAD] that a few years ago we had something similar to this in the Veterans' Committee in connection with an allowance for men in the Veterans' Bureau who traveled around the country defending cases for the Government on veterans' insurance. I brought out at that time an instance where a man from the Veterans' Bureau trying such cases came back and owed himself $800 after his tour of the United States trying cases for the Government. This was after making allowance for the amount given him by the Government.

As I understand the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MEAD], the Postmaster General is now authorized to give these men $3 a day, but under the present appropriation he cannot give them anything except $2. An example of this is where a man travels from Boston to Albany in the Railway Mail Service. He has to stay over in Albany for a day. Under this appropriation he is given $2 for this day. I do not know where anyone in the country can get a decent, clean room and three square meals a day for $2, especially when he is not permanently renting a room but is on a tour of duty in Albany or some place else.

Mr. DUNN of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNERY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DUNN of Pennsylvania. The amendment offered by the gentleman from New York is a just amendment and should be passed. May I ask the gentleman whether it is not a fact that most of the Federal employees today are not receiving adequate wages? In other words, the United States Government says that a married couple must have at least $2,500 a year; yet we have thousands of men and women who are compelled to work for the Federal Government and who are receiving less than $900.

Mr. CONNERY. The distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania, being a member of the Labor Committee, knows we have had plenty of testimony before that committee to show the need for raising all wages of workers in the United States. The United States Government, I may further say, set a very bad example in the Economy Act, because as soon as we cut the wages of the Federal employees the United States Steel Corporation and similar large corporations put in a 15-percent cut on their employees the same day.

Mr. MEAD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNERY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MEAD. Let us get some official information in the RECORD. On page 139 of the hearings Mr. Donaldson, representing the Department, makes the following explanation:

> That takes into consideration the rate of $2 per day paid to railway postal clerks under the law for traveling allowances. While the law provides a rate of $3 a day, the rate is fixed at $2 under the Economy Act, and we are asking for the same amount, assuming that the Economy Act will be carried forward into the next year.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the Economy Act is not carried forward, and I am simply complying with the law.

Mr. CONNERY. May I say, in closing, I hope the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MEAD] will be agreed to.

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

Mr. Chairman, the attitude of the committee and the House seems to indicate that the Membership of the House has been convinced by the extravagance program of the President that they do not have to pay any attention at all to the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget or to the testimony of the different department heads. I appreciate, under those circumstances, it is almost useless for committees to go ahead and go through with hearings on these appropriations. I appreciate that the attitude of the President himself, with his tremendous extravagance program, has brought about this situation, and, frankly, I do not believe it is going to be of any use whatever for anybody to urge economy while this program is going on.

In view of this situation, I believe it is up to the Membership of the House, in view of the fact that they do not care to pay any attention to the facts brought out in the hearings, to go ahead and vote just as they please.

For myself, I shall continue to vote for economy, even though the administration and the majority of this House have become demoralized by the extravagance program of the administration and the Democratic Party.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. Chairman, this is the first time during my service with him for many years that I have seen the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] retreat under fire. These amendments seem to have him on the run.

About the best thing left to be done is for the chairman of the subcommittee in charge of this bill, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARNOLD], whose committee has given weeks of careful, patient study to this matter, to move that the Committee rise, and then ask that this bill be recommitted to a joint session of the legislative Post Office Committee and the Labor Committee, and allow the gentleman from New York [Mr. MEAD] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONNERY] to rewrite the whole bill.

Mr. CONNERY. I wish that would be done. We would take care of the matter.

Mr. BLANTON. We should let the gentlemen from New York and Massachusetts call in the gentleman from California [Mr. HOEPPEL] to distribute all Government resources.

Mr. Chairman, this shows you what organization will do. These postal employees are thoroughly organized. I could get up here and go along with my friend from New York and vote for a million-dollar increase here and a million-dollar increase there and a million-dollar increase somewhere else, and then have a solid organization behind me on anything I want from them at home.

Mr. SHORT. Does not the gentleman believe in organization?

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman from the Joplin district evidently does, for he is going along with it and voting for all of these million-dollar amendments.

Mr. SHORT. I am for it 100 percent.

Mr. BLANTON. The only man on the Republican side who has stood up here against these several million-dollar inroads made on the Treasury has been the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], and now you seem to have him intimidated. You have had a solid Republican vote en masse here for all of these million-dollar amendments.

Mr. TABER. I am still going to vote against this one.

Mr. BLANTON. But even the gentleman seems to have capitulated.

Mr. TABER. But I know that the other side of the House has yielded with respect to these amendments.

Mr. BLANTON. They seem to have whipped the gentleman from New York until they have taken the fight out of him on these million-dollar amendments. [Laughter.]

Mr. HOEPPEL rose.

Mr. BLANTON. I want to tell my friend from California what is going to happen. If he will go back to California and tell all of his constituents that he has voted for all these million-dollar amendments, over the request of the Department and against the Budget of the President, he will have all the postal employees for him; but there will be lots of voters in his district back in California who will say, "Mr. HOEPPEL, we believe you ought to have stood by the President and upheld his financial program."

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

Mr. BLANTON. Certainly.

Mr. HOEPPEL. I may tell the gentleman from Texas that during my campaign I criticized various features of the new deal, including the destruction of cattle and crops, and in all my speeches I said I would stand with the President when I thought he was right, but when I thought he proposed legislation which was against the best interests of the people, I would vote for the people. This amendment, in my opinion, is in the interest of the people.

Mr. BLANTON. If the gentleman made a campaign against the President he is the only so-called "Democrat" in this House who was reelected on such a platform. [Laughter.]

Most of the Democrats I know anything about, and most of those whom I had anything to do with helping to come back here, came back here because they were backing the President. It was a campaign of standing behind the President that brought them back here.

Mr. HOEPPEL. I pledged my constituents that I would support the President in his security program, which he advanced here on June 8, but little did I realize he would submit to us a starvation pension for our aged citizens.

Mr. BLANTON. I am going out to California this summer and look over the gentleman's constituents. I want to see how they look. [Laughter and applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. KVALE. Mr. Chairman, just a moment ago, when I yielded to the Chairman of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads to offer his amendment, I had intended to offer an amendment at line 4, page 53—which is the previous paragraph—to strike out the word "service", for the purpose of discussing the service which the railway mail clerks give us.

I had hoped that the Chairman of the Post Office and Post Roads Committee would offer an amendment to the salary provision similar to the one he offered to the travel-pay item, and I wonder if we cannot still return to it for that purpose, because the hearings disclose that the funds which are provided in this bill are $100,000 below what was requested through the Budget, and inadequate to meet the cost of paying these men and filling additional positions as the added needs of the service require.

The service now is notoriously undermanned. If any Member wants to go through an unusual experience, if he comes from a metropolitan area, let that Member go down to a terminal, or let him ask permission to ride on a railway mail car, let him see the tremendous tasks which these men, overburdened with work, are asked to assume day after day as part of their duties. Let him see how these sacks and piles of mail accumulate in the terminals and then he will wonder, as I have wondered, why there has not been a mass protest from the business—the commercial, the industrial, and the financial groups in the larger cities, where mail is being delayed in many instances a full business day over what might normally be expected from the Postal Service.

You will then see the need for giving proper and prompt attention to this undermanned and overworked and overburdened Railway Mail Service.

I have not prepared such an amendment, but I had hoped that the Chairman of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, in line with the other amendments which he has offered, would also give attention to this need, because it is an actual need facing us today, and I think we will have to meet it very shortly. As I previously stated, I shall be surprised if there does not soon come a mass protest and organized objections on the part of the industrial, the business, the commercial, and the financial groups whose need is for prompt and efficient mail-delivery service. [Applause.]

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

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

I would, at this time, like to pay a tribute to the work and the time that the distinguished Chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations [Mr. ARNOLD] has put on this bill. I do not want any misunderstanding about my feeling on that matter, but I always separate my personal feeling and admiration for a man in Congress and the work that he does from the principles in which I believe—decent wages, the rights of the workers to get what is coming to them.

I thoroughly understand it is the job of the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, as well as the Appropriations Committee, to keep down the expenses of government as much as they can and at the same time to be as fair and as just as they can.

We understand the functions of the Bureau of the Budget. They usually pare down what the departments ask, and many times just demands are not acceded to by the Bureau of the Budget.

I do not think my friend the gentleman from Texas would want any railway mailman who arrives in a town for his day's stopover to be obliged to go to what the gentleman from New York calls a "flop house" or go to a cheap restaurant to get something to eat. If the gentleman from Texas would go on one of these railway mail cars and see how they have to work, see that they have no time, throwing mail continually into this box and bag and into that box and bag, no chance at all for rest, he would agree that these splendid Americans are entitled to three square meals and a decent lodging.

Mr. BLANTON. There are many splendid Americans now living on $2 a day. And you would be surprised to know just how many splendid Americans there are just now who would be glad to get $2 per day allowed on expenses in addition to their wages.

Mr. CONNERY. I do not know how any splendid American can live on $2 a day and remain a splendid American. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. SHORT. I am surprised that our friend from Texas, who voted for the $4,000,000,000 bill, can come in here and quibble over giving these railway men an extra dollar a day.

Mr. BLANTON. That bill was to employ 3,500,000 unemployed Americans and pay them at least $50 per month, so that they could earn an honest living, and many of them are in the Joplin district of Missouri.

Mr. DUNN of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNERY. I yield.

Mr. DUNN of Pennsylvania. Is it not a fact that when we send a committee abroad to investigate various things we do not compel them to live on $2 a day?

Mr. CONNERY. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is correct.

Mr. KVALE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNERY. I yield.

Mr. KVALE. I want to say that my criticism was not leveled against the committee or the chairman of the subcommittee, who is a splendid chairman, but to the short-sighted policy that wants to wring a little economy out of this group and deprive them of what they really ought to have.

Mr. CONNERY. The postal employees are something like the men in uniform during the war. They might be called the "peace-time army" representing the United States Gov-

ernment. Every householder, every man, every woman, every child, to whom mail is delivered, looks to them as representatives of the United States Government. They are entitled to decent pay.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. Chairman, I think it would be a contribution to this debate if it were brought out now, in view of what has been brought out by several Members, that our travel allowance has been restored in full by the Budget. I commend the Bureau of the Budget on its good judgment. And I might say to the gentleman that the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, whom I also admire, will not have the difficulty he is experiencing now next year when he brings this same appropriation bill out, because we will have repealed the last item of the Economy Act.

Mr. DUFFEY of Ohio. And is it not true that in another department of the Government an allowance of $4 a day is given?

Mr. CONNERY. Yes.

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

Mr. CONNERY. Yes.

Mr. ARNOLD. Does not the gentleman from New York [Mr. MEAD] know that the Bureau of the Budget has nothing to do with the travel pay of Members of Congress, and does not the gentleman from New York know that that matter is fixed entirely by the Membership of the House, without any recommendation or reference of any kind from the Bureau of the Budget? The gentleman from New York ought not to make a statement of that kind.

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

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman be extended for 2 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. CONNERY. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. I believe that the gentleman from Massachusetts will admit that with respect to many postal employees, after many Members of Congress pay all of their expenses and demands made on them, there are postal employees who at the end of the month, out of their salaries, have just as much left over as a Member of Congress has out of his. Is not that true?

Mr. CONNERY. I believe that the postal employees in many cases have more left out of their salaries than the average Congressman; but neither the Members of Congress nor the postal employees are getting the salaries to which they are entitled, and the Congress ought to raise those salaries.

Mr. COX. And is it not apparent to the gentleman that the Committee of the Whole is emasculating a piece of legislation that was very carefully constructed, and that it is time to desist?

Mr. CONNERY. I do not think so. I think we are merely asking the passage of amendments which will insure decent pay and decent living and decent traveling allowance for men in the Postal Service. I hope the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MEAD] will be agreed to.

Mr. MEAD. And the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] very eloquently pleaded for our rights only a few days ago.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has again expired.

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Chairman, permit me to make a statement with regard to the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MEAD]. In 1925 this maintenance allowance to railway mail clerks was increased from $2 a day to $3. Members should not get the idea that that is a travel pay. It applies to railway mail clerks when they have been out on their runs more than 10 hours, and was intended to cover the lodging of the railway mail clerk at the other end of the line, when it was impossible for him to get back to his home. It was never intended to supplant the board or keep of a railway mail clerk while he was on regular duty or when he was at home any more than salaried employees are given an allowance beyond their salary for keep or board. When the Economy Act was passed that allowance was reduced to $2 per day. The amount was not fixed arbitrarily at $3 a day or $2 a day, but it does empower the Postmaster General to fix an allowance to help in paying for maintenance for the time they are out on their runs exceeding 10 hours at not to exceed $2, as fixed by the Economy Act, and, prior to the economy act, not to exceed $3 a day. Let me call attention further to the fact that each employee in this whole service has had his wage fully restored by this bill. The 15-percent cut that was made by the economy act has been restored. They will get 100 percent of their salaries. I do not know what other people might think about it, but it occurs to me that we ought to give some heed to the President's recommendation through the Bureau of the Budget. Those men have made a thorough study and investigation of that matter. Those men are more capable of determining these questions than we are here on the floor of the House.

They have all of the facts and all of the information at their disposal. We have just such information that we gain here on the floor of the House. It is true that the provision reducing the allowance to $2 a day expires at the end of this fiscal year. The Bureau of the Budget came to us with their recommendation that this matter be continued with a limit of $2 per day during the fiscal year 1936, and your Committee on Appropriations is submitting the matter to you just as it came to us through the Bureau of the Budget. Members should not lose sight of the fact that the travel pay and travel allowance of all Government employees has been permanently reduced $1 per day. That is not temporary at all. That is permanent law. We are simply asking here, under the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget, that this limitation of $2 be kept in effect during the fiscal year 1935, and it is not intended to pay all of the expenses of the men, their board and lodging, while they are out. It is simply intended as a contribution to them to assist them, to some extent, in paying for their lodging while they are out on their service more than 10 hours on a run.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MEAD].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were—ayes 91, noes 25.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Electric- and cable-car service: For electric- and cable-car service, $360,000.

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

Mr. Chairman, on the division on the last vote we had this afternoon, we now see the result of the support that was given by the majority to the extravagant program of the President last week.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

Foreign Mail Service, Merchant Marine Act: For transportation of foreign mails under contracts authorized by the Merchant Marine Act of 1928 (U. S. C., title 46, secs. 861–889; Supp. VII, title 46, secs. 886–891x), including the cost of advertising in connection with the award of contracts authorized by said act, $28,850,000: *Provided*, That no part of the money herein appropriated shall be paid on contract no. 56 to the Seatrain Co.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MASSINGALE: After the word "company", in line 10, page 55, strike out the period and insert a comma and the following words: "or any other contract authorized by the Merchant Marine Act of 1928, unless and until the investigation ordered by the President on July 11, 1934, reveals to the satisfaction of the President that such contract is fair and that it is free from fraud or corruption practiced either by officials administering the Merchant Marine Act or the owner or operator of the ship or ships with whom such contract was made."

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment that it is legislation on an appropriation bill and not a limitation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from New Jersey on the point of order.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Chairman, the paragraph under consideration appropriates for the foreign mail service under

the Merchant Marine Act, for transportation of foreign mails under contracts authorized by the Merchant Marine Act of 1928, including the cost of advertising in connection with the award of contracts authorized by said act, $28,850,000. The proviso is—

That no part of the money herein appropriated shall be paid on contract no. 56 to the Seatrain Co.

As a general proposition, this is legislation; because, if under the guise of limitation, an amendment is proposed which imposes upon any official of the Government duties not heretofore imposed upon him expressly by law, it is legislation, and therefore not in order on an appropriation bill. As I heard the amendment read, it does impose upon the President and those who act in his behalf a duty to review again the provisions of existing contracts which otherwise is not imposed upon them by law.

The fact that it is not a limitation that is immediately ascertainable is also emphasized by the language in the amendment which, as I recall it, makes it contingent upon the outcome or completion of a certain investigation which may or may not be completed during the time this money is available that is here appropriated.

If by reason of the fact there is a proviso which says that money may not be taken out of this appropriation for the payment of a certain contract numbered 56 involving the Seatrain Co. the amendment should be considered in order, I make the further point of order that the amendment is not germane to the proviso to which it is attached, which deals only with the Seatrain contract and does not deal with the merchant marine contracts, generally.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, I base my point of order on two grounds: That the amendment constitutes legislation upon an appropriation bill, and that the amendment is not germane to the proviso to which it relates.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

The gentleman from Oklahoma offers an amendment, on page 66 of the bill, after the proviso ending in line 10. This paragraph of the bill relates to the foreign mail service under the Merchant Marine Act. The proviso states that no part of the money herein appropriated shall be paid on contract no. 56 to the Seatrain Co.

The gentleman from New Jersey made a point of order, first, as to it being legislation upon an appropriation bill, and, secondly, as to its germaneness.

The Chair is of the opinion, after fully studying the amendment and the proviso which it proposes to amend, that the amendment is not germane to the proviso in this paragraph, and, therefore, sustains the point of order.

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

I wonder if the chairman of the subcommittee could tell us why the limitation is only against one contract, specifically no. 56, with the Seatrain Co., and still permits the Seatrain Co. and the United States Government to enter into other contracts? This contract, as I understand it, is tied up in the Court of Claims, but if the one contract is proven invalid why is it the committee, through this specific limitation, still leaves the Seatrain Co. open to make other contracts?

Mr. ARNOLD. No payment has been made under the Seatrain contract, and the question involved is whether or not the Seatrain Co. is engaged in foreign commerce or is engaged in coastwise commerce. If it is engaged in coastwise commerce, then it is not entitled to benefits under the Merchant Marine Act; if it is engaged in foreign commerce, perhaps it would be. This Seatrain Co. operates a car ferry from New Orleans to Habana, touching, I believe, some place in Florida. For this reason the committee a few years ago held the matter up with a limitation in the bill that none of the money could be used to pay on that contract, thinking that it was improper and illegal. The matter is now being threshed out in the Court of Claims, and we want to continue that position until the matter is judicially determined.

Mr. KVALE. Pending the disposition of that legislation, I wonder why the prohibition is only against the one contract and not against any contract that may be entered into with that company? My recollection may be faulty, but it seems to me that the appropriation bills in 1929 or 1930, when the proviso was first inserted, referred to "any contract with the Seatrain Co.", and not to contract no. 56.

Mr. ARNOLD. There have been no contracts entered into by the present administration under the Merchant Marine Act.

Mr. KVALE. I thank the gentleman. That is what I wanted to bring out. The hearings are not enlightening on that point.

Mr. ARNOLD. And we have assurances that there will be none until this matter as to the legality of the contracts that are now in operation under the Merchant Marine Act is determined.

Mr. BLAND. The matter has been taken up, and reports have been made by the Interdepartmental Committee and the Cabinet Committee, and is now before the President at the present time.

Mr. KVALE. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BURDICK. Do I understand the ruling of the Chair to be that in a bill of this kind where a contract is excepted because we have reason to believe it was unfairly entered into that we cannot offer an amendment to include other contracts similarly entered into?

The CHAIRMAN. In answer to the gentleman, the Chair will say that the rule is that where you have one specific proposition, such as there is in this proviso, you cannot offer an amendment which would make it a general proposition.

Mr. MASSINGALE. Mr. Chairman, I offered an amendment, reading as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MASSINGALE: After the word "company" in line 10, page 55, strike out the period and insert a comma and the following words: "or any other contract authorized by the Merchant Marine Act of 1928, unless and until the investigation ordered by the President on July 11, 1934, reveals to the satisfaction of the President that such contract is fair and that it is free from fraud or corruption practiced by officials of the Merchant Marine Act, or the owner or operator of the ship or ships with whom such contract was made."

The bill (H. R. 4442) to which this amendment was offered was a bill making appropriation for the Treasury and the Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, and for other purposes. As is suggested in the amendment, the words to be inserted follow the word "company" on line 10 of the bill.

I wish to call attention to the fact that the bill itself asks for $28,850,000 for carrying the mail under the so-called "Merchant Marine Act contracts of 1928", with the expressed provision:

That no part of the money herein appropriated shall be paid on contract no. 56 to the Seatrain Co.

This amendment forbids the payment of any money on any other contract made under the Merchant Marine Act of 1928, unless and until the President of the United States determines that such contract is fair and that it is free from fraud or corruption practiced by any party to the contract.

In this connection, I desire to call attention to a few facts: Accompanying the bill there was distributed to the members a report submitted by the Committee on Appropriations, making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936. In this report the following language is used by the Committee on Appropriations:

Under Executive order of the President of July 11, 1934, the Post Office Department is investigating both the Merchant Marine Act contracts and the foreign air mail contracts. A study is also being made for report to the President by an interdepartmental committee on the general subject of merchant-marine policy. Pending these reports and action upon them by the President, the Budget has recommended the continuance of the current appropriations for both foreign air mail and Merchant Marine Act contracts. The current obligation, if no change is made in these contracts, is approximately $7,000,000 for the air mail contracts, and

on the basis of expenditures for 1934 the cost on the Merchant Marine Act contracts would be $29,600,000. If the maximum of service as called for by the Merchant Marine Act contracts were permitted to be utilized, the cost in 1936 would be $32,851,000.

In view of the existing contract obligations and uncertainty as to what conclusions may be reached as the result of these studies or what action may be taken with respect to any of these contracts, the committee has approved the recommendations of the Budget to continue the amount of the 1935 appropriations. If any readjustments are effected in any of the contracts that will effect economies in the expenditures of these sums, the Government will get the benefit of the savings.

It requires only a casual glance at this report to see that under the direction of the President, the Post Office Department is investigating the Merchant Marine Act contracts, and the committee further states that, pending these reports, and action upon them by the President, the Budget has recommended the continuance of the current appropriations for the Merchant Marine Act contracts, with the statement that on the basis of 1934 expenditures the cost for carrying mail under the Merchant Marine Act contracts would be $29,600,000; then the committee states that in view of the existing contract obligations and in view of the uncertainty as to what conclusions may be reached as a result of the investigation, or what action may be taken with respect to any of the Merchant Marine Act contracts, the committee has approved and recommends the continuance of the appropriation, and states that if any readjustments are effected in any of the contracts that will effect economies in the expenditures of the sums appropriated the Government will get the benefit of the saving.

The report of the committee shows that the cost of carrying the mail under Merchant Marine Act contracts is $29,611,481.99, whereas on weight basis paid to other American ships the cost would be $2,598,962.86. This means that it costs the Government $27,012,519.13 more to have the same mail carried by the merchant-marine ships than to have it carried by other American ships.

The mere reading of the report of the Committee on Appropriations carries conviction to my mind that the contracts that were entered into for carrying the mail on merchant-marine ships were corrupt, and so viewing it, I offered the above amendment.

The amendment was offered, not as any criticism of the Committee on Appropriations, but it was offered for the reason that, in my judgment, no Member of Congress ought to sit by and see the public money, to the extent of $28,850,000, expended on contracts which the committee's report shows to be suspicious and even tainted with fraud or corruption.

Let me ask why it is that the bill itself expressly provides that no part of the money appropriated shall be paid on contract no. 56 to the Seatrain Co. and not include all other contracts that might be fraudulent. I think it is certainly logical to state that if the Committee on Appropriations had not entertained the idea that the contracts were not fair contracts, it would not have called attention in their report to the fact that the contracts were then under investigation; and when the committee was fair enough to do this for Congress, it appears to me to be obligatory on the part of somebody to specifically raise the question of whether or not we, as Members, would sanction a further appropriation of the money of the Government of the United States on these contracts.

It is elementary among lawyers that when a party to a contract ascertains that there is fraud in the making of the contract, then the proper procedure for him to take, in order to clear his own skirts and to be released from the binding force of that contract, is to take steps to rescind the contract or to be released from it.

No less an authority than the Supreme Court of the United States has used this very apt language regarding the question of repudiation of contracts when fraud is discovered:

Where a party desires to rescind upon the ground of a mistake or fraud, he must, upon the discovery of the facts, at once announce his purpose, and adhere to it. If he be silent, and continue to treat the property as his own, he will be held to have waived the objection and will be conclusively bound by the contract, as if the mistake, or fraud, had not occurred. He is not permitted to play fast and loose. Delay and vacillation are fatal to the right which had before subsisted.

The above language is found in the case of *Grymes* v. *Sanders et al.* (93 U. S. 62). In fact, it is of common general knowledge that a person cannot overlook fraud, or dilly-dally about it when he discovers its existence in any contract. He must assert his rights unless he expects to shut up his mouth and pay.

It occurs to me that with the express statement from the Appropriations Committee that the contracts for which appropriation is sought to be carried on are fraudulent and were not fairly entered into, Congress is deliberately closing its lips to the fraud that was practiced upon the Government of the United States, and at the same time is opening the purse of the Treasury of the United States to the persons who perpetrate the fraud, to walk up and help themselves. So far as I am individually concerned, I am not going to do it.

A committee was appointed sometime back for the purpose of investigating these contracts, and the hearings fill 9 volumes of reasonable size and in all these investigations contain a total of 4,180 pages.

Of course, I have not read all the reports, and I confess that most of the information I have is newspaper information, but I do know this: Out in our part of the world, the newspapers in Oklahoma carried black headlines apprising the people of the facts brought out in the hearings of the committee on investigation of the air mail and ocean mail contracts. The information was startling, and it was difficult for any person to believe that a contract was entered into for carrying the mail that involved as much as several thousand dollars for carrying an ordinary common letter bearing a 2- or 3-cent stamp on it. In addition to that, the papers carried the further announcement that a lot of the ships that were sold to the corporations, organized for the purpose of getting mail contracts, were sold by the Government to these corporations for practically nothing and after the purchase of the ships, the Government entered into the mail-carrying contracts which are under consideration and for which the appropriation is asked in this bill. The papers also contained the information that money was borrowed at a small rate, one-half of 1 percent, by these ship corporations, from the Government, and our people could not believe such a statement as that because they had been in the habit of paying 10 percent for their money.

Opposition to my motion was made upon the ground that I did not know anything about the contracts or was not informed as to them. I grant that I do not have any intimate knowledge of just exactly who made the contracts or what induced the making of them, and I do not think the volunteer information that the merchant marine may be a necessary adjunct to our Navy in time of war justifies or excuses fraud in any form.

In fact, according to my conception of right and wrong, fraud can never be justified. If the Government of the United States wishes to subsidize ships, and it has a right to do it, they should all be subsidized alike, and Congress should quit authorizing the making of contracts that an ordinary person cannot understand. If we want to subsidize a particular ship or particular ships, according to tonnage, then let it be a fixed amount to each ship and not conceal or cover up by paying unreasonable and extravagant amounts of money for carrying a few letters.

In order to show that the newspapers out our way were not wholly in error, I quote the following from page 100 of the hearings before the special committee of the United States Senate on investigation of air mail and ocean mail contracts, at the second session of the Seventy-third Congress, pursuant to Senate Resolution No. 349. A statement was made by the chairman and is as follows:

The CHAIRMAN. While we are waiting for the witness, I should like to put into the record a little reference to the amounts paid the Export on mail per pound. This is for the Export only at this time and not for all the companies.

August 20, 1929, 11 ships carried 1 pound of mail for which they were paid $115,335.

From July 1929 to June 20, 1930, 1 pound of mail was carried for which a payment was made of $125,820. These records are given in the report of the Postmaster General. This is a letter

from the Postmaster General transmitted in response to Senate Resolution 85, Document No. 69, and I have just read from page 412.

From July 19, 1930, to June 20, 1921, there were 8 pounds of letters carried, and the payment was $125,820.

From August 10, 1928 (this is on p. 43) to June 15, 1929, there were 3 pounds of letters carried at a cost of $243,980, or $81,326 per pound.

On pages 413 and 414 of the same report we find from January 15, 1930, to June 14, 1930, 4 pounds of letters were carried and the payment was $265,310, an average of $66,328 per pound.

From August 15, 1928, to June 10, 1929 (p. 415 of the same report) there were 4 pounds of mail for which the Government paid $350,725.

For the total year 1929 the mail pay to the Export Steamship Co. was $1,209,187. The average per pound in that total payment for that time was $66,083. The remaining information in connection with it can be found in Senate Document 69, Seventy-second Congress, first session.

The total for the year 1932 for the Export, according to a report which has been supplied to us but has not yet been established by the Post Office Department, the total paid to the Export for the mail contract was $1,498,030.

For certain ships appearing under branch A, these ships received $125,820 for 9 pounds of letters, or an average of $13,980 per pound.

Branch B steamers received a total of $121,990 for 6 pounds, or an average of $20,333 per pound.

The total for 1933, according to the report from the Post Office Department, for the Export Steamship Co. was $1,498,030.

Senator KING. Is that the calendar year or fiscal year?

The CHAIRMAN. Fiscal year.

Senator KING. Up to June 30?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes, sir.

Senator KING. Those were under contracts made prior to March 4?

The CHAIRMAN. All made prior to March 4. The contract which was originally made was altered or amended March 20, 1931. The original contract, which had been made in 1928, was amended by the Postmaster General, giving an increased classification, raising the amount given to certain vessels—class-4 vessels—from $2.50 to $4 per mile.

Senator KING. What is the date of that amendation of the contract?

The CHAIRMAN. March 20, 1931.

The chairman was of opinion that on the evidence taken in the first 100 pages of the investigation 11 ships carry 1 pound of mail for which they were paid $115,335; that another pound of mail was carried for which $125,820 was paid; and another 8 pounds of letters were carried and the Government paid $125,820 for these; that from August 10, 1928, to June 15, 1929, 3 pounds of letters were carried which cost $243,980, or $81,326 a pound; that from January 15 to June 14, 1930, 4 pounds of letters were carried and the payment was $265,310, or an average price of $66,328 a pound; another instance was from August 15, 1928, to June 10, 1929, 4 pounds of mail were carried and cost the Government $350,725, and thus it goes.

Now, all these apparent robberies committed in the merchant-marine mail-carrying contracts may have redounded to the good of the Government of the United States in opening new markets and mail routes for steamship corporations, but the only justification that I have heard so far for the letting of these contracts is that we might use these ships as an auxiliary to the Navy in case we have another war.

I mention the fact that somebody that represented the merchant marine, the Shipping Board, or some other agency of the Government did not treat all of the shipowners alike; that some of them had to pay exorbitant (?) rates of interest as much as one-half of 1 percent per annum, for money borrowed from the United States; and now let me quote page 130, of volume 1, of the special committee, supra:

The CHAIRMAN. What was the lowest rate of interest charged on the export ships that they purchased from the Shipping Board?

Mr. NEVIN. Purchase of ships?

The CHAIRMAN. I mean borrowed money.

Mr. NEVIN. We borrowed—one loan at one-half of 1 percent, based on the Treasury's interpretation of the Merchant Marine Act provisions——

The CHAIRMAN. You borrowed one at three-eighths of 1 percent, did you not?

Mr. NEVIN. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. How much was the amount you borrowed at three-eighths of 1 percent? Have you that record there?

Mr. NEVIN. $1,725,000.

The CHAIRMAN. And how much at one-half of 1 percent?

Mr. NEVIN. The same amount.

The CHAIRMAN. The same amount?

Mr. NEVIN. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. How much at 1½?

Mr. NEVIN. The same amount.

The CHAIRMAN. How much at 1¼?

Mr. NEVIN. The same amount.

The CHAIRMAN. That was the four big ships for which the loans were made?

Mr. NEVIN. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And that constituted the bulk of the loans now owed the Government?

Mr. NEVIN. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And that is the interest which is now being paid?

Mr. NEVIN. Yes, sir. We paid 5½ percent during the cost of the construction.

The CHAIRMAN. That averages about seven-eighths of 1 percent on that interest, is it not?

Mr. NEVIN. The last time I figured it, I thought it figured close to 1 percent. I was considering the 5 and—

The CHAIRMAN. A little less than 1 percent. Now, if you had borrowed all that money at 5½ percent instead of at the rate it was borrowed during the time—I do not know whether you have these figures or not, but they were furnished by the Shipping Board—it would have cost you, in addition to interest you actually paid, $2,853,000. Have you those figures or have you computed them?

Mr. NEVIN. No, sir.

And in the same connection, I quote the following from pages 155 and 156 of the same hearing:

The CHAIRMAN. You don't know whether you think it is wrong for one company to receive money at one-eighth of 1 percent, and another company to have to pay 5½ percent and up?

Mr. BAKER. I don't know what the facts are. I know there is a difference in the rate for construction loans for ships engaged in foreign trade as against construction loans for ships engaged in coastwise trade.

The CHAIRMAN. I understood you to say to Senator MCCARRAN you were not willing to state you thought it was wrong for one company to get money for one-eighth of 1 percent and others to have to pay a great deal more.

Those latter excerpts from the testimony taken at these hearings show, at least to my mind, that somebody was favored by the Government of the United States, or some agency of the Government of the United States, when these contracts were made and this money borrowed.

And as I said before, the people out our way do not understand such transactions, and they will not understand why Congress is voting to ratify such contracts. Evidently some agency or person represented the Government of the United States when these contracts were made, and it was the duty of such representative of the Government to see that fair contracts were entered into. Somebody evidently failed to properly represent the Government in the making of these contracts.

The public thinks that these contracts were saturated with fraud; and from the report made by the Appropriations Committee accompanying the bill under consideration, I think the public has a proper conception of these contracts. My position is that no appropriation should be made in furtherance of the contracts; and if the merchant marine ships want to carry the mail of the United States Government, they should be permitted to carry it without any obligation on the part of the Government to pay what appears to be exorbitant and unconscionable rates for carrying it. I am satisfied that these ships will carry the mail and risk the Government's paying what it is worth to carry it after the conclusion of the investigation.

So, Mr. Chairman, in view of the wording of the bill itself, which excepts one fraudulent contract from the operation of the appropriations, and in view of the further fact that the Appropriations Committee itself reported that other contracts were at least suspicious, it occurs to me that there is nothing left for the Congress to do but to refuse an appropriation for any of the merchant marine mail-carrying contracts until the President completes his examination and advises the Congress just what, in the light of the facts, should be done.

The Clerk read as follows:

Contract Air Mail Service: For the inland transportation of mail by aircraft, as authorized by law, and for the incidental expenses thereof, including not to exceed $19,100 for supervisory officials and clerks at air mail transfer points, and not to exceed $39,965 for personal services in the District of Columbia and incidental and travel expenses, $10,700,000.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I only want about 2 minutes to call attention to the need of enlarging the domestic Air Mail

Service by increasing the route mileage and the airplane mileage. This provision in the bill carries $10,700,000 for the inland transportation of mail by aircraft. This includes $1,200,000 for further extension and additional schedules.

It appears, however, that no further extensions can be made without additional legislation. In the Air Mail Act of the Seventy-third Congress it was provided that the maximum air mail route mileage should be 29,000 miles and the airplane mileage 40,000,000 miles.

As early as last December the route mileage was exhausted, so it will be impossible for the Department to make any further extension of routes, even though any part of the $1,200,000 should be available for that purpose.

A bill has been introduced, and I call the attention of the able Chairman of the Post Office Committee to its provision to increase the air mail route mileage from 29,000 to 35,000 miles and increase the airplane mileage from 40,000,000 to 45,000,000 miles.

I think the demands made for the service are very encouraging, and I trust when the gentleman calls his committee together to consider the legislation that the result will be the reporting of an amendment making provisions which will meet the growing demand for the use of airways.

Mr. MEAD. I want to say to the gentleman that the committee will begin hearings next Tuesday on the air mail and it will have the commissioners appointed by the President before it. The committee will be glad to hear the gentleman from Colorado, and I will say that I am in sympathy with the object of increasing the route mileage.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. I thank the gentleman for his statement.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

Rural Delivery Service: For pay of rural carriers, auxiliary carriers, substitutes for rural carriers on annual and sick leave, clerks in charge of rural stations, and tolls and ferriage, Rural Delivery Service, and for the incidental expenses thereof, $94,000,000.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. ARNOLD: Page 56, line 3, strike out "$94,000,000" and insert "$94,300,000."

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is designed to extend to some extent the rural mail service. One hundred thousand dollars of this it is contemplated will be used for the establishment of new routes and $200,000 will be used to expand existing routes. There is pending in the Department a number of applications for routes that have been already inspected and approved. It will take this amount of money to establish those new routes and the extension of routes. I think it will leave them possibly between $50,000 and $75,000 more for the establishment of new routes and extensions that have not been approved, new routes that might come in on applications hereafter presented, but this money will take care of all approved new routes and all approved extensions of existing routes. Your committee went into the matter very carefully. We are convinced that this additional money should be made available here for that purpose.

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

Mr. ARNOLD. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Was there any evidence before the committee that it is the purpose of the Department to consolidate the rural mail routes? What is to be the policy in the future?

Mr. ARNOLD. The days of consolidation are not entirely passed. They can consolidate only where the carrier is entitled to retirement. They cannot consolidate routes and take a carrier off any place, unless that carrier is entitled to retirement. There are many routes yet in the country that are not up to the standard of what the Department thinks they might eventually go, but those routes will remain as they are, according to my information, until such time as it is necessary to retire the carrier, and then the matter of consolidation will be taken up.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Are these consolidations determined entirely on mileage or do they take into consideration the volume of business handled?

Mr. ARNOLD. I think probably they take into consideration more the condition of the roads they have to go over.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Does the gentleman not think that the volume of business ought to be considered?

Mr. ARNOLD. I do not think the volume of business that a rural carrier handles enters into it very materially. It might to some extent. The normal route now is fixed at 30 miles. It was 24 miles until the last session of Congress. A number of routes in the country run 45 and 50 and 60 miles. That altogether depends on the condition of the highways to be traveled, with respect to the length of these routes that are finally consolidated.

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

Mr. ARNOLD. Yes.

Mr. WEARIN. Do I understand the gentleman to say that this amount will take care of all of the applications for rural-route extensions now pending with the Department?

Mr. ARNOLD. I do not know that it will take care of all those now pending. It will take care of all of those that have been approved. There is quite a number of them.

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

Mr. FORD of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I have just sent an amendment to the desk exactly as the one offered as the committee amendment by the gentleman from Illinois. Therefore I withdraw my amendment. I think the committee amendment should be adopted. It is evident that in the past 2 years economy has been uppermost in the minds of those in charge of the Post Office Department, and while there is no one that favors economy in government more than I, nevertheless I do not feel that the rural service should be neglected, but that the people living in the rural sections of our country are entitled to have their mail delivered just as the city people have theirs delivered. The rural routes have contributed wonderfully and materially to the development of our country. In the past 2 years there have been many consolidations of rural routes, and this, in my opinion, has greatly disrupted our rural service. I know of many instances where rural routes have been consolidated over the protest of all of the patrons of the route, as well as the Congressman, and I know that the service is greatly impaired as a result of the consolidations, but it seems to be the policy of the Post Office Department to consolidate regardless of the wishes of the patrons. During the past year the Post Office Department has approved a large number of extensions of routes, so as to give service to a large number of people that have been walking miles to get their mail, but they have been unable to start the mail over the extensions because of lack of funds. We can render a great service to our people by voting for this amendment, and I hope my colleagues will all join in favoring its adoption. [Applause.]

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

Mr. CARPENTER. Mr. Chairman, before the gentleman begins his remarks, will he yield to me for a moment?

I understood that we passed a bill at the last session of Congress, sponsored by the gentleman's committee, that would stop this consolidation and would freeze the routes as they were then.

Mr. MEAD. There was no restriction as to the length of routes in the bill. The provisions in the bill call for an extension of standard routes from 24 to 30 miles. In other words, a carrier would be called upon to take care of 30 miles for the same salary he formerly received for taking care of 24 miles. In addition to that, his pay was reduced from $30 per annum per mile in excess of the standard route to $20 per annum per mile in excess of the standard route, and, in addition to that, we increased his equipment allowance from 4 cents to 5 cents per mile. In the long run it is a reduction in income to the personnel and a saving to the Department.

Mr. CARPENTER. Was that contemplated to stop this consolidation?

Mr. MEAD. It was assumed that as a result of the saving the Department would let up on the consolidation of rural routes.

Mr. CARPENTER. But the Department did not follow that out? They continued to consolidate?

Mr. MEAD. Yes; in order to save money and keep within the appropriation.

Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of the amendment submitted by the chairman of the subcommittee. This amendment proposes to give to the Department the right to give service on all of the extensions and all of the new routes that have been so far approved by the Department. It is a meritorious amendment. I believe it also provides a sufficient sum of money for contemplated extensions which will be approved during the coming fiscal year. In the last 2 or 3 years the development of the rural service has been retarded by reason of efforts to economize. This amendment will improve the postal service in the rural communities. It will provide the Department with a sufficient amount of money to bring the Rural Delivery Service up to date.

By adopting this amendment we are assuming the proper prerogative of the House. The Department was advised by the Budget not to make any recommendations for new service. New services, of course, are necessary and essential. Everybody in a rural community knows that. This is an instance where the committee and the Congress are rising up to their rightful position and dictating the policy rather than to be taking orders from the Bureau of the Budget. I congratulate the subcommittee. I commend its chairman for presenting this amendment. It is a deserving amendment. Like the amendments I offered, it permits the Department to carry on a program unmolested by diminished or inadequate appropriation.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Of course, I am delighted that the amendment has been submitted by the chairman of the subcommittee having charge of this appropriation, to provide some relief for patrons of the Rural Free Delivery Service, who have not been able to procure necessary extensions in the last several years.

I want to point out that the hearings disclose there are 2,761 extensions that have already been approved, and that it will require $217,000 to install those extensions. Those are already approved. The sum of money that is added to the appropriation by the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARNOLD] will therefore probably not be sufficient to take care of any additional extensions hereafter found warranted by the Department, if any part of it worth mentioning is used to establish new routes, but will probably take care of those which have already been found justified. However, this appropriation does not become available until July 1 of the present year. These extensions already having been found justified, and having been approved for future installation, I wish to inquire now of the gentleman from Illinois, chairman of the subcommittee, if he would have any objection to the addition to his amendment of these words, "of which amount the sum of $300,000 shall become immediately available"? If that language should be added to the gentleman's amendment, the Department would not have to wait until the 1st of July in order to install these extensions that have already been approved.

I can conceive of no reasonable objection to the addition of that language and the making of this fund immediately available for that purpose. May I inquire of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARNOLD] if he would object to an amendment of that character?

Mr. ARNOLD. I do not think it is advisable to do that. As I understand it, the Post Office officials told us they would proceed just as rapidly as they could to put these new routes and extensions into operation. I would rather not agree at this time to the amendment.

Mr. TARVER. I judge from the remarks of my colleague that he, in reality, has no objection, so I intend to offer the amendment for the consideration of the Committee.

Mr. Chairman, I move to amend the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois by striking the period at the end thereof and adding a comma and the words:

Of which amount the sum of $300,000 shall become immediately available.

I ask recognition in favor of the amendment I have proposed.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TARVER: At the end of the committee amendment insert a comma and the words "of which amount the sum of $300,000 shall become immediately available."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. TABER. Would not the effect of this amendment be to reduce by one-third the additions to rural routes that could be effected, because it would make it immediately available, and result in much less service being put on than if the item was not available until the 1st of July?

Mr. TARVER. I cannot conceive of how that result might follow. I think the gentleman will find on either page 188 or 189 of the hearings, the testimony of Mr. Burke relative to this subject matter, in which he gives the exact number of rural-route extensions that have already been approved, and he estimates the probable cost of placing them into effect at about $217,000. The chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARNOLD], states that the purpose of his amendment is to enable the Department to put into effect the extensions that have already been approved. If that is the purpose, then why, in the name of common sense, should we ask the farmers of the country, who will be benefited by this service, to wait until the 1st of July before extensions already authorized or approved could be made effective? Why not make the amount of money which is proposed to be made available by this amendment for this purpose immediately available? What conceivable objection could exist to such course? I do not understand that the effect of my amendment would in any way decrease the chances of securing additional extensions to the Rural Free Delivery Service.

Mr. TABER. Just look at this situation: If you make the money go over a longer period, there can be less done.

That is the effect of it. It will mean that a great many of the extensions that could be made if the money was left so it was available until July 1 cannot be made.

Mr. TARVER. Does not the gentleman think, in view of the statements made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARNOLD] as to the purposes of this addition to the appropriation, that if it should be adopted by the House with this additional language added the Department would consider it its duty immediately to install these extensions that have already been approved?

Mr. TABER. I doubt if the Department would be able to do that.

Mr. TARVER. Certainly there is no reason to postpone the installation of additional service which has been authorized in some instances as far back as 2 or 3 years. There is no reason for further delay. The Department, under the statement of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARNOLD], will certainly install the approved extensions as soon as the money is made available, which should be now instead of July 1; and future maintenance of such service, even if the additional appropriation should not be sufficient to include the rest of this fiscal year, will certainly be provided.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is upon the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

Mr. CARPENTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last five words.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder how many members of the Committee have not received this kind of a letter from some constituents living on a rural route:

If you knew the conditions out here we do not believe that you would take our rural route away from us.

We Members of Congress are so connected with the Post Office Department, especially the Members of the majority party, that this post-office proposition is always on our doorsteps. People out in the rural districts cannot see any justification for these consolidations and curtailments of service when the Government is spending so much money for everything else. Whenever in our little towns and villages with only one rural route a vacancy occurs the Department steps in there arbitrarily and consolidates that route with another. This means the death knell of that village; and the Member of Congress does not know anything about it until the consolidation has occurred. He is not conferred with, and it does not make any difference how long the Member of Congress has known those people out there or how many letters he writes to them he cannot convince them that he was not the one who did it.

The people in the rural communities feel that instead of curtailing this service more rural carriers ought to be employed. They feel that instead of adding to the mileage and thereby increasing the salary of a rural carrier who already receives a good salary that the work should be divided up as much as possible and the service extended. In many of my counties there are even bankers, lawyers, and business men who would like to have one of these rural carrier jobs.

When you go down to the Department about it they talk to you about the "Budget", and they say: "We would like to do it, but the Budget will not let us"; and this you are to explain to your constituents. How are you going to explain to your constituents that we have to economize $4,000,000 in the Post Office Department here in Washington when your constituents read in the morning paper the next day after they receive your letter that the Government is spending $65,000,000 for new post-office buildings all over the country?

We recognize the fact, of course, that because of modern means of conveyance, good roads, and so forth, there can be some consolidations. These country folks are practical people. Why, instead of sending out these inspectors who slip into a little town at night, speak with the postmaster, get out before morning, and make a report stating that the people do not need the service or can get along without it—why instead do they not consult with the people affected along the routes and talk with them and ascertain their wishes? As I say, those folks are reasonable and recognize the fact that a consolidation may be practical, but they resent being ignored.

I commend the committee for having brought in this amendment. I am for the amendment, because it will mean the establishment of a lot of extensions that are needed. I have had the experience in asking for extensions and have received in reply a letter saying there were only 15 or 25 families to be accommodated and 1 and sometimes 2 to be discommoded. Therefore your application is turned down—and you are left to go out there and try to explain this to these people.

These are some of the things with which we Congressmen are confronted. I think we ought to do something about these consolidations and extensions so that we can give the service these people are entitled to and which they want.

[Here the gavel fell.]

By unanimous consent, the pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF THE THIRD ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL

Manufacture and distribution of stamps and stamped paper: For manufacture of adhesive postage stamps, special-delivery stamps, books of stamps, stamped envelops, newspaper wrappers, postal cards, and for coiling of stamps, and including not to exceed $22,100 for pay of agent and assistants to examine and distribute stamped envelops and newspaper wrappers, and for expenses of agency, $4,207,150.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MILLARD: Page 56, line 11, after the figures at the end of the line, insert:

"*Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the manufacture and distribution of any postage stamps that shall not be fully perforated and gummed and ready for sale at post offices or other places where postage stamps are sold."

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment.

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

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment is not a limitation but is a direction to do a certain thing. It therefore becomes legislation and is not a proper amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

It is the opinion of the Chair that this amendment is in order. It is clearly a limitation upon the appropriation, and the Chair therefore overrules the point of order.

Mr. MILLARD. Mr. Chairman, the amendment proposes a prohibition which will in the future make it impossible for an officer or employee in the Post Office Department to issue or distribute incomplete stamps or stamps in any way different from those on sale to the public in the regular way through the recognized distributing agencies.

Someone has suggested that there should be a law enacted in reference to this matter. The gentleman from New York said there was no law, and he is correct. I could not offer an amendment putting law into this appropriation bill, because it would be then subject to a point of order. This is the best that can be done in an appropriation bill.

While I am not myself a serious philatelist and have no profound knowledge of the subject, I know that a stamp which differs even in the smallest detail from the usual run is considered by collectors, because of these differences, of great value. This is the basis of the complaint, to which I called the attention of the House on Monday, made by the philatelic societies throughout the country against the distribution, by the head of one of the executive departments, of imperforate sheets of stamps which are not available to the public but which have a tremendous value in the philatelic market.

In this connection it is interesting to note the value in the philatelic market of a stamp having only the most minute imperfection. The following are examples taken from Scott's special United States catalog for 1935:

Number	Description	Price
250a	1894 issue, 2¢, triangle I imperforated horizontally	$100
250b	1894 issue, 2¢, pair imperforated between	200
289a	1898 issue, 8¢, velvet brown imperforated horizontally	500
295a	1901 issue, 2¢, carmine and black center inverted	2,700
296a	1901 issue, 4¢, chocolate and black center inverted	1,200

Perhaps the most famous example of the value of an unusual stamp is that of the air mail stamp on which the plane was inadvertantly printed upside down.

These quotations barely scratch the surface, but they give a splendid example of the vast fortunes which could be amassed by irresponsible persons in whose hands might fall the imperforate sheets of stamps which have caused so much comment. There is nothing to prevent the estates of the persons now in possession of these sheets, even if their present owners do not wish to take advantage of their sale value, selling them for exorbitant prices. This will be the natural consequence when the sheets fall into the hands of the next generation, where the interest in stamps exists only insofar as their money value is concerned. There is proof that some of these imperforate sheets of stamps issued by the Postmaster General have already been placed on the market for sale in several parts of the country.

Imperfect stamps have until recently been issued through error or oversight only, and the stamps thus distributed are of particular value because of their scarcity. Great care has always been exercised by the Bureau of Engraving and Printing against the removal from the Bureau of unfinished or incomplete stamps, though careful investigation fails to indicate there is a law prohibiting such a removal. In my opinion, such a law should be passed by the Congress, for I am informed that the Bureau, in the printing and issuance

of stamps, merely acts as a manufacturer with a contract and executes the orders of the Postmaster General just as instructed.

The seriousness of removals from the Bureau is exemplified by the following story, which I have been unable to verify as to fact, but which serves to illustrate my point:

I am told that one of the finest of the designers of United States stamps at the Bureau had been considered entitled to retain a proof copy of each of his designs. This privilege was rescinded by the Bureau, however, and the designer offered the Director his resignation. His services were so valuable that a special concession was made in his case, and for a while he was again permitted to retain a single proof copy of his designs. At a later date the privilege was again taken from him, and this time he resigned rather than to forfeit his privilege. The Bureau thereby lost a skilled designer who could only be replaced with difficulty, and probably not at all.

Stamp collectors are belligerent because some few officials of the Federal Government and their friends should be in a position to purchase at their face value or have presented to them by the head of one of the executive departments stamps printed on imperforate sheets that the general public cannot buy except at tremendous cost. They have somewhat the same feeling about men in public office that the English people have for the Prince of Wales. When the Prince was in Australia, the strikers on their railroads would not allow passenger trains to run, but they offered to make a special concession in his case and let the Prince's train go through. When informed of this, the Prince inquired, "Will the public be allowed to ride with me?" The response was in the negative, and the Prince replied, "Then I will not ride." He did not take advantage of his high office, and the American people expect and demand the same fair play from their own executives.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MILLARD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLARD. In offering the amendment to the appropriation bill I feel that moneys made available for the manufacture and issuance of stamps for the Post Office Department should be restricted so as to make it prohibitive for incomplete or imperfect stamps, so far as humanly possible, to be distributed, unless such distribution is made to the general public when any person desiring them may be given the opportunity to make his purchase in the open market.

I hope that the Committee will accept the amendment and that the House will pass it.

Mr. Chairman, I submit, this amendment should receive the unanimous support of the Committee.

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MILLARD].

Mr. Chairman, it is clearly to be seen that this amendment is offered because of some feeling on the part of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MILLARD] by reason of the stir that has been raised in the past few weeks in the press and on this floor in regard to some stamps.

As I understand the situation, the Post Office Department has not been acting differently or doing other than previous Postmasters General have done in matters of this kind. Of course, it is unfortunate that one of these sheets did get into the hands of a man who tried to commercialize it and took the matter up with some of these philatelic agencies, intending thereby to reap profit for himself. It created quite a little stir. So far as I know, there is only one of these sheets that has gone into the channels of commerce.

Mr. Chairman, there is no necessity at all for an amendment of this kind, and I hope that the Members will vote it down. The purpose of the amendment is a direct reflection and attack upon the Postmaster General. If the Members believe in upholding the Postmaster General, who has been one of the best, most competent, and thoroughly efficient men ever to hold that portfolio, they should vote down this amendment. On the contrary, if they are willing to go along and join with the opposition to assail and assault the Postmaster General, hoping to gain some partisan advantage, because perhaps some little slip was made and one of these sheets was inadvertently sold, go ahead and vote for the amendment. So far as I am concerned, I intend to oppose the amendment, and I do not propose to give aid and comfort to the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle who have been trying to make a mountain out of a molehill with references to some of these stamps.

Mr. SHORT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARNOLD. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. Does not the gentleman feel that the amendment would prevent the recurrence of such an unfortunate situation?

Mr. ARNOLD. May I say to the gentleman that it has been the policy of Postmasters General in the past to give the original run or specimen stamps to high officials in the Government. It has been the policy of Postmasters General in the past to make up an album of some of these specimen stamps, containing many stamps, and deliver them to the delegates to the International Postal Convention, and no complaint was ever made before.

Why should this matter be taken up at this time and the House asked to vote a direct reflection upon the present Postmaster General? Partisanship is the motive back of it all.

Mr. BACON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARNOLD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BACON. Assuming it has been done by previous Postmasters General, does not the gentleman think it is a bad policy and that now is the time to stop it for all time in the future?

Mr. ARNOLD. I think it is a bad policy to commercialize these stamps, but this is a case where there was no commercializing of these stamps. Inadvertently only one sheet in question was sold for its face value, $6, and an attempt was made to place it on the market by the gentleman who was fortunate enough to buy it. The Government received full pay for the stamps. I am not concerned about the rivalry of stamp collectors. No wrong has been done, no law violated.

Mr. MILLARD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARNOLD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MILLARD. I did not offer this amendment for any political reason but did present it for protection of the stamp collectors of the Nation.

Mr. ARNOLD. I understood from what the gentleman stated and from what he said on the floor of the House the other day what is back of this. The gentleman is after the Postmaster General.

Mr. MILLARD. I am not after the Postmaster General.

[Here the gavel fell.]

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

Mr. Chairman, the Postmaster General is just as much in favor as is the gentleman from New York [Mr. MILLARD] of stopping irregularities, and he will stop them. I do not believe in issuing sheets of unperforate and ungummed stamps, but no harm came from it. There was nothing dishonest about it. The Government did not lose one penny. The Postmaster General paid for them unperforated and ungummed just as much as he, you, or I would have paid for them gummed and perforated.

The Postmaster General probably followed the custom of previous Postmasters General with respect to buying and distributing new issues of these stamps.

There is nothing unusual about a man in the Government service wanting to keep as a memento something incident to his service. I have known of Members here who have sat in an office chair for 20 years; and when they left and the chair was condemned and sold as useless, these Members would have the chair bought and sent down to their homes. When this youngster here from Missouri whom you Republicans are using on the front lines so much gets older and goes back

to Joplin 20 or 30 years from now, he will want to buy and take his chair with him.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. MILLARD] has absolute confidence in the Postmaster General, in his honesty, in his integrity, and in his every single act with respect to this Government. This is just a hamstringing proposition.

I do not blame you fellows on the other side. I feel sorry for you. You fellows used to sit in your palatial committee-chairmanship offices and had all your prerequisites. We Democrats would have to come and kneel down to you for every little thing we wanted. We used to jump on your administration about this and that, but we did it about big matters. We did not do that about little inconspicuous, insignificant matters. I feel sorry for you, Senator. It is quite a come-down to you, but be patient and do not lose your equilibrium. There are plenty of big things for us to fight about for this Government and in the interest of all the people. If we could combine our forces across the aisle and fight against the big waste and big extravagance prevalent for many years in these bureaus that ought to stop, we would be getting somewhere.

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

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman has not been here long enough to find out much about it, but after he has been here 5 or 6 or 10 years and is able to do something besides orate and sermonize, he will then probably be able to enlighten us on these things.

Why cannot you fellows be good sports and go along with us and help us to stop extravagance wherever we find it and let us stop waste and not devote our time to little picayune matters about stamps that are paid for just as you and I pay for them? The Government has not lost a dollar, but on waste of hundreds of millions of dollars and on extravagance of hundreds of millions of dollars let us Democrats and Republicans get together and make a common fight against them.

Mr. SHORT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I would rather yield to your straw boss over there from Massachusetts, because he knows more about it, but I yield to my friend from Joplin.

Mr. SHORT. I know that our good friend from Texas is a very hard-working and able gentleman who watches the Treasury and is sincere when he states he wants to put an end to extravagance, but it amazes me that he can vote to give the President $5,000,000,000 and then come here this afternoon and object to voting $1,000,000 to these poor railway mail clerks.

Mr. BLANTON. That was a bill to provide work for 3,500,000 unemployed heads of families in the United States, and some of it is to feed starving constituents in the gentleman's district down in Missouri. Our railway mail clerks and all of our postal employees have good jobs, good pay, short hours, and the retirement privileges on pay when they get old. They are not suffering.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I have been here quite a little while, and this is the first time I have heard gentlemen on the Democratic side of the aisle come before the House and say to us that they know something wrong has been done, that they are sorry it has been done, but that no remedy should be applied to stop it.

Is it not time we took the bull by the horns and ourselves wrote legislation into this bill that will stop wrong being done in the future? Everyone who has spoken here has said that something wrong had been done. Now, let us go on and do right. Let us pass this amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MILLARD] and say to the Postmaster General, just as the gentleman from Illinois and just as the gentleman from Texas say, that we should not do wrong any more, and let us fix it so it cannot be done any more.

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

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. You are going to have a solid Republican vote for this amendment, are you not?

Mr. TABER. And every gentleman on the Democratic side who wants to see the right thing done is going to vote for this amendment. Those who want to see things run wild and want to see the gentleman from Texas go along and favor doing things that ought not to be done, and that he knows ought not to be done, will vote against it. I have never seen Members on the Democratic side get up and say that it was wrong and that the amendment is right and then vote the other way. There is no excuse for that kind of thing back home. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. MILLARD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

I simply want a moment to recall to my friend from Illinois, whom I respect and admire very much, the fact that my secretary called up the former head of this Department of Philately, and he said that no ungummed or imperforate stamps had ever been issued during the 12 years he was at the head of that Department. The stamps you are talking about now that were issued before were gummed and perforated, and they are not valuable.

You further say that there is only one instance which the Postmaster General admits, and that is the case in Norfolk, Va., and yet the Scott Stamp Co. had an offer of these stamps by a man from Washington for $20,000, and they are willing to give the name to the post-office inspector. They have sent for the inspector twice, but he has not been there.

I received in the mail this morning an anonymous letter, to which I paid no attention; but in the next mail I received a letter which states:

> DEAR SIR: I can't tell you how interested stamp collectors are in your resolution to have an investigation—

This is no investigation, but a resolution of inquiry—

> into the promiscuous handing out of favors by the Post Office Department in the form of imperforate sheets.
>
> Suppose you know that Barney Gimble, the Philadelphia department-store owner and "palsy-walsy" of Farley, received 10 sheets of the 2-cent park issue, for which I would have gladly given $20,000 a sheet. I could make at least $100,000 profit.
>
> Yours truly,
>
> ROBERTA ROE.

This letter came this morning, and I have other evidence of other stamps being on sale. If you want this to go on, then vote against this amendment. The people in my county do not want it to go on.

This is no reflection on the Postmaster General. He just did something that was unethical that he did not understand. I do not charge him with any violation of law but with doing something that was unethical that should be stopped.

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

Mr. MILLARD. I yield.

Mr. HOOK. Will the gentleman tell me what good this country is getting out of a bunch of stamp collectors? [Laughter.]

Mr. MILLARD. Well, these stamp collectors paid into the Government Treasury last year about $3,000,000 that the Government would not have received otherwise. President Roosevelt is one of them. There are 9,000,000 of them in our country, and they are among our best citizens.

Mr. HOOK. Are we helping the Nation by putting over such an amendment?

Mr. MILLARD. I think you are; because you are helping 9,000,000 people of the Nation to get a square deal.

Mr. HOOK. Or is the gentleman simply trying to pull something smart for the Republican side of the House?

Mr. MILLARD. I am not doing that at all, and I leave it for people on the other side of the aisle to decide whether you should be for the amendment or not.

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

Mr. MILLARD. I yield.

Mr. KLEBERG. I simply want to put myself on record as being one of the Democrats over here who does not think that all of this hullaballoo over this small matter of the creation of a new misdemeanor or a new crime or a new kind of high treason amounts to a hill of beans. I do not

think the Postmaster General did wrong in giving out a few unperforated, ungummed, unmarketable stamps to a few gentlemen worthy of high trust who are his friends. This, too, after the Postmaster General paid for them.

May I say to my friend that if these stamps had gone out in the usual way they might have brought a higher figure at a later day from stamp collectors. The financial, economic, business, and social structure of the Nation has received no injury or shock except through the reverberation that has come from that side of the aisle.

Mr. MILLARD. I want to say that the gentleman has a different conception from mine. There are 9,000,000 stamp collectors in this Nation who have rights. I personally would not object if these stamps were given only to the President of the United States. But he gave them to the Secretary of the Interior, to the President's Secretary, Louis Howe, to his three children, and others, and they are worth thousands of dollars, and I think that practice should be stopped. [Applause.]

Mr. BLANTON. If I can forgive the President for appointing the Secretary of the Interior, the gentleman ought to forgive the Postmaster General for giving him the stamps. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MILLARD].

The question was taken; and on a division there were 52 ayes and 73 noes.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Temporary details: Section 214 of part II of the Legislative Appropriation Act, approved June 30, 1932, is hereby continued in full force and effect during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936; and for the purpose of making such section applicable to such fiscal year the figures "1933" shall be read as "1936."

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the paragraph that it is legislation. It says:

Two hundred and fourteen of part II of the Legislative Appropriation Act approved June 30, 1932, is hereby continued in full force and effect during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936.

That is legislation. That is continuing the act of 1932, which by its terms expires in 1935.

Mr. ARNOLD. I think it is true that this is subject to a point of order, but may I say that this gives additional employment to a great number of employees. It cannot possibly hurt anybody. It does not affect their wages but it does give some of them more work to do. I do not think it ought to go out, and I ask the gentleman to withdraw his point of order.

Mr. LEHLBACH. It gives the Department the power to switch a man from a clerk to a carrier or from a carrier to a clerk temporarily. Under the terms he could put a clerk after a service of 2 weeks on the street and then come back and serve as clerk again. It is a bad practice, and there is no reason for continuing it.

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman understands that this is merely a temporary transfer. There are places where the business might be seriously impaired if they could not make a temporary transfer for a few days now and then. That is all this does. It is in the interest of economy. It does not hurt any of the employees in any way, shape, or form, but does give some of them additional work, and it promotes efficiency.

Mr. LEHLBACH. It does not give anybody additional work. It saves the Government's paying for a substitute.

Mr. ARNOLD. It permits a clerk, if he is not at work, to take some other work temporarily, such as a rural carrier route, or something of that kind, and keeps the work of the Post Office Department going. It has been found most beneficial.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New Jersey insist upon the point of order?

Mr. LEHLBACH. I do.

Mr. TRUAX. The gentleman from Illinois states that this provision has been found beneficial to the employees. Is it not a fact the employees concerned do not approve of this provision which has been in effect since the act of 1932, the so-called "Hoover Economy Act"?

Mr. ARNOLD. I do not know whether it has been found satisfactory to all employees or not. I know some of the employees have expressed themselves to me as being entirely satisfied with it.

Mr. TRUAX. I understand that the employees affected are opposed to this provision and claim it does not provide more employment.

Mr. ARNOLD. Of course, it will go out on a point of order, if the gentleman from New Jersey insists upon it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey insists upon his point of order, and the Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will correct the spelling of the word "Executive" on page 65.

There was no objection.

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

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BULWINKLE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 4442, the Treasury and Post Office appropriation bill, and had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? [After a pause.] If not, the Chair will put them en gros. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

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

PRESENTATION OF VIEWS IN CONNECTION WITH FOREIGN-TRADE AGREEMENTS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, we have heard considerable discussion during the week between the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARLAN] in reference to reciprocal-trade agreements and the rights of individuals to be heard in respect thereto. I have secured a copy of the announcement of the policy of the Department with reference to hearings, and so forth, and I ask unanimous consent that I may place it in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. From what department?

Mr. COCHRAN. The State Department. It includes the proclamation of the President and the order of the State Department.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to is as follows:

EXECUTIVE ORDER

PUBLIC NOTICE AND PRESENTATION OF VIEWS IN CONNECTION WITH FOREIGN-TRADE AGREEMENTS

Whereas section 4 of the act of Congress approved June 12, 1934, entitled "An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930", provides:

"SEC. 4. Before any foreign-trade agreement is concluded with any foreign government or instrumentality thereof under the pro-

visions of this act, reasonable public notice of the intention to negotiate an agreement with such government or instrumentality shall be given in order that any interested person may have an opportunity to present his views to the President, or to such agency as the President may designate, under such rules and regulations as the President may prescribe; and before concluding such agreement the President shall seek information and advice with respect thereto from the United States Tariff Commission, the Departments of State, Agriculture, and Commerce, and from such other sources as he may deem appropriate":

Now, therefore, I, Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States of America, acting under and by virtue of the authority vested in me by the aforesaid section, prescribe the following procedure with respect to the giving of public notice of the intention to negotiate trade agreements and with respect to the granting of opportunity on the part of interested persons to present their views:

1. At least 30 days before any foreign-trade agreement is concluded under the provisions of the act, notice of the intention to negotiate such agreement shall be given by the Secretary of State. Such notice shall be issued to the press and published in Press Releases of the Department of State, the weekly Treasury Decisions, and Commerce Reports.

2. Persons desiring to present their views with respect to any such proposed agreement shall present them to a committee to be known as the "Committee for Reciprocity Information." Said committee, hereinafter referred to as the committee, shall consist of members designated from the personnel of their respective departments or offices by the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Commerce, the National Recovery Administrator, the Chairman of the Tariff Commission, the special adviser to the President on foreign trade, and the heads of such other Federal departments or offices as may be named from time to time by the Executive Committee on Commercial Policy. The committee shall function under the direction and supervision of, and its chairman shall be designated from among the members of the committee by, the Executive Committee on Commercial Policy.

3. The form and manner in which views may be presented, the place at which they shall be presented, and the time limitations for such presentation shall from time to time be prescribed by the committee, which may designate such subcommittees as it may deem necessary.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 27, 1934.*

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
July 3, 1934.

The Committee for Reciprocity Information held its first meeting today under the chairmanship of United States Tariff Commissioner Thomas Walker Page. The committee has been established by Executive order to receive information and views from persons interested in any proposed foreign-trade agreement negotiations under the act of June 12, 1934. The membership of the committee is as follows: Thomas Walker Page, vice chairman, United States Tariff Commission; Robert Frazer, American consul general, Department of State; Leslie A. Wheeler, in charge Division of Foreign Agricultural Service, Department of Agriculture; Henry Chalmers, Chief Division of Foreign Tariffs, Department of Commerce (acting); John Lee Coulter, former member of the United States Tariff Commission and now connected with the Office of the Special Adviser to the President on Foreign Trade; and H. D. Gresham, Acting Chief Imports Division, National Recovery Administration (acting).

The committee at today's meeting adopted the following regulations for the guidance of persons desiring to present their views in connection with any proposed trade agreement:

"COMMITTEE FOR RECIPROCITY INFORMATION, WASHINGTON

"PUBLIC NOTICE

"Form and manner of presenting views in connection with proposed foreign-trade agreements and time limits for such presentation prescribed

"Pursuant to section 4 of the act of Congress approved June 12, 1934, entitled 'An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930', and Executive Order No. 6750, of June 27, 1934, the following form, manner, and time limitations with respect to the presentation of information and views by persons interested in the negotiation of any foreign-trade agreement are prescribed;

"Form and manner of presentation: Information and views shall be presented to the chairman, Committee for Reciprocity Information, United States Tariff Commission, Washington, D. C., in the form of written statements. Such statements shall be duly sworn to and shall be either typewritten or printed, in sextuplet, and each of the six copies shall be legible. If the statements relate to duties or other trade restrictions affecting more than one product, each product must be treated separately and statements with respect to each product shall begin on a separate page.

"Supplementary oral presentation: Supplementary views may be presented orally only upon application to the chairman and after written statements have been submitted in proper form. Such application may be made in writing to the chairman and shall set forth concisely the reasons therefor. Also, the application shall state whether it is desired to present supplementary information and views concerning tariffs or other trade restrictions of the foreign country with respect to which the Secretary of State has given public notice of intention to negotiate a foreign-trade agreement or concerning tariffs or other trade restrictions of the United States. The committee will consider the application and inform the applicant whether or not it is approved.

"Oral statements shall be made under oath.

"Any oral presentation of views hereunder shall not be in the nature of a public hearing.

"Time limitations: The time limits within which information and views in writing and applications for supplemental oral presentation of views shall be submitted, as well as the time for supplemental oral presentation of information and views, will be prescribed by the committee in connection with each proposed foreign-trade agreement and will be made public in behalf of the committee by the Secretary of State simultaneously with his notice of the intention to negotiate each proposed agreement.

"WASHINGTON, D. C., *July 3, 1934.*"

THE REPUBLICAN PARTY—ITS PRESENT OPPORTUNITY AND RESPONSIBILITY

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a radio address delivered by a former Member of the House, Mr. Robert Simmons, of Nebraska.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by former Congressman Robert G. Simmons, of Nebraska, at Cooper Union, New York City, and broadcast over the network of the American Broadcasting System, January 31, 1935.

The address is as follows:

Permit me first to thank you for the honor you do me in asking me to speak here. We of the West are not dead or dying, dismembered, or discouraged. Faith in ourselves, in our form of government, in our future, still dominates our thinking and acting. I come from that section of America where the Republican Party in the last election demonstrated that it can take a licking and come back fighting, and where it is on its way back to strength and power.

The prime purpose of a political party must be to serve the best interests of this Nation. Our first concern should be to be right. We must base our appeal to the American people upon principles of government that are sound. The Republican Party should not win on any other basis. We must again chart the course of America, with the basic purpose of developing free government and protecting the liberties and rights of the individual citizen.

There are some principles that cannot be compromised. Either we shall have a government based upon the liberty and initiative of the individual, or we shall have a planned society under some form of authoritarian government or dictatorship based upon force, and necessarily admitting that we no longer have the capacity of self-government.

The reactionary party in America, as elsewhere, is that party which would take this Nation back to a system of centralized government, government by men and not laws; by decrees and edicts and force. The liberal party is that party which believes in solving our problems and going forward under a government of laws and not the whims or decrees of minor and major officials. A true liberal is one who moves away from, not toward, the age-old discarded system of government domination, direction, and control of the individual citizen.

Since the war, nation after nation has turned from democratic government to some form of dictatorship. These movements have all started during an economic crisis and in the name of reform. They have first had a great national hero; then a strong centralized government, which, gradually, or speedily, encroached upon the rights of the individual citizen and local self-government, until in the space of a few years a large part of the world's population has lost all semblance of free government.

In America principle of government has given away to the expedient of passion. Constitutional government is yielding to mob psychology and individual liberties are being surrendered to bureaucratic supervision and control. Only the vigilance of an aroused and understanding citizenship will prevent America going the whole way toward a complete loss of our individual freedom.

We are told these days that the purpose of things now being done is to make for a fuller, a more abundant life. The first essential for an abundant life for an American citizen is the maintenance of the liberty of the individual—liberty of thought, action, deed. Huxley said, "An economic paradise may be a military hell."

There are those who would have us believe that the Constitution of the United States is the dead rigid hand of the past, thwarting our will, retarding progress, and condemning us to a slow national death. To me it is the practical framework for the maintenance of those living, vital, eternal truths of self-government that have been evolved by civilized man's age-old effort to better rule himself. Its prime function is to protect the individual citizen from the tyranny of government and the despotism of the strong and powerful. In its effect upon the individual citizen there is no essential difference between the despotism of one person and the despotism of a million.

The Republican Party was born in a crisis and led in a fight to free a people from bondage to other people. It can and will have a rebirth by leading in a fight to free our people from bondage to their Government and the tyranny of those the Government has put over them.

The obligation to maintain and live within constitutional powers rests as heavily upon the President and the Congress as it does upon the Supreme Court. The Republican Party must insist upon Congress and the legislatures of the various States performing their constitutional function of lawmaking.

We need in America a revival of the spirit of the pioneer, who dared and suffered, who fought and died, for the realization of an ideal and the preservation of a nation.

We have a constant challenge for a platform and a program. The Republican Party has stood for certain definite principles. It has always been the party of sound money, of a balanced budget, and national economy.

The Republican Party has always been for a decrease in taxes.

Under a Republican administration and by a Republican Congress in both branches the amendment to the Federal Constitution providing for income taxes was submitted to the several States. These taxes are levied upon the principle of taxing those best able to pay.

The Republican Party has always been for a reduction of the national debt. The Republican Party reduced the debt from $26,000,000,000 to $16,000,000,000 from 1920 to 1930. That constitutes a world record in debt reduction.

The Democratic Party is now engaged in increasing that debt to a new and all-time high. Add to the total of Federal governmental expense the normal operating costs and interest burdens of our State, county, city, school, and other public-taxing agencies, increased as they have been and as they must be in order to meet their compulsory contribution to aid the Federal spending program, and you reach a total of spending and a total of debts and taxes that stuns and retards normal business growth and expansion, diminishes employment, takes from the people their purchasing power for necessities and luxuries, blights the lives of our people, and constitutes a burden that no government can long endure. We need now a revival of those principles of economy, reduced spending, and Government sanity so well exemplified by the administration of Calvin Coolidge. Such a restoration would, to use his words, "directly affect millions of taxpayers, release large sums for investment in new enterprises, stimulate industrial production and agricultural consumption."

The Republican Party has always been the party of progress. We must urge the adoption of liberal and constructive policies based on sound political and economic principles.

The Republican Party has never been the party of ballyhoo or demagoguery. It has believed in a government of laws and not of men. It has never believed in predatory wealth or the abuse of public trust. It presents a record of half a century fighting and correcting these evils.

A Republican President, Theodore Roosevelt, led in the movement for the conservation and development of the Nation's resources. A Republican President, Herbert Hoover, established the program of public improvements to give employment to labor, organized the Better Homes Association, and laid the groundwork for the whole movement of home and slum improvement. He recommended the initial Home Loan Act.

The Republican Party has fostered and advanced the initiative of the individual citizen. Measure the development in wealth and character, in material advantages, moral stamina, and religious precept during the 70 years of dominant Republican leadership in America. Let that be the answer to those who say we have failed to serve this Nation.

During the years of Republican administration, from 1922 to 1932, American labor reached its highest period of wages, protection, and independence of action. As a result of policies adopted by Republican Congresses and approved by Republican Presidents, organized labor not only prospered but lived at peace with its employers in all major industries. Contrast those 10 years with the period of industrial strife, strikes, and dissension that has marked the last 2 years of Democratic administration.

Not only was there industrial peace, but the United States Government, under the civil-service policy initiated, sustained, and strengthened by every Republican President, went a long way toward the goal of merit in Government service. Witness the prostitution by the present administration of the civil service to partisanship. Not only should we return to the civil-service standards, but going beyond that we should encourage the setting up of a system whereby Government service may become career work for those who enter it.

There is rightly much concern about social programs and social legislation for the care of the aged and unfortunate, for the protection of women and children, the advancement of education; leadership in the cultural and religious development of our people, has always had and always will have the support, thought, and aid of Republicans, both State and National. Theodore Roosevelt and Herbert Hoover laid the foundations for practically all the legislation we have today in the protection of children's welfare. The child-labor amendment to the Federal Constitution was submitted to the States by a Republican Congress.

The President's last message reflects the attitude of the whole country toward the sick, the aged, the unemployed, and the unfortunate. It is a continuance of that program of social reform which has been going on under Republican Presidents since the foundation of the party. The Republican Party of today wants a progressive, sane development of social policies. The Democratic Party does not have a monopoly on the humane, the sympathetic, the forward-moving ideals of this country. There is no basic difference between us in the social ideals. But there is a basic difference in the mechanics for solution of these problems between Republicans and the administration now in power. We believe the problems of a sick country can and should be solved by aiding and strengthening local units of government by working through existing agencies and preserving self-government inviolate. This administration has sought to solve these problems by ignoring existing agencies and the setting up of a new and vastly more expensive system of government, with its bureaucratic domination, direction, and control from Washington.

The Republican Party has always stood for the protection of industry, agriculture, and labor through the protective tariff. The Agricultural Adjustment Act and the National Recovery Act are both of necessity dependent upon the maintenance of the Republican tariff structure. The Democratic Party during these 2 years has vindicated the Republican tariff policy.

On the question of monopoly, remember that Republican administrations passed the Sherman Act, created the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Power Commission, and the Radio Commission. By contrast the Democratic Party has set up under the N. R. A. the most complete and astonishing, powerful, and far-reaching series of business monopolies that the world has ever known. They have not only effectually suspended the Sherman Antitrust Act but have used the power of the Federal Government to supersede and nullify the antitrust and antimonopoly laws of the 48 States. Let us fight monopolies, but recognize that Government protected and fostered monopolies can be and are just as inimical to the welfare of the country as private monopoly, and far more difficult to eradicate.

The Republican Party needs men and women of stamina who will stand up and say that these fundamental principles are what the Republican Party has always stood for, and on the basis of a record of service it will continue to build for the good of our country.

The solution of two basic problems is necessary before there can be national economic recovery. The first is to stop the ever-increasing unemployment in the country and put men back to work in private industry. The second is to stop the ever-mounting burden of national debt and assure the business man, farmer, and laborer alike that they may look forward to the time when the burden of debt and taxes will not continue to mount, and with some hope that there may be a decrease. Increasing the indebtedness and taxes is a major contributing factor to our increased unemployment.

The entire program of this administration is a program each step of which results in augmenting and not diminishing the problem they are trying to solve. We shall solve that problem by adopting a policy toward business, agriculture, and labor that will encourage men and women to take reasonable chances and put men back to work in private industry. With men going back to work there will be increasing consumption of the products of farm and factory, and with that increased consumption will come better times.

President Roosevelt should frankly outline the permanent financial policies of his administration. The American people will go a long way toward solving the problems of recovery if the attitude of the Government is a known and not an unknown quantity in the equation. Uncertainty of business, political, and governmental programs and policies is now the largest influence in retarding recovery. That uncertainty and doubt must be supplanted by certainty and confidence.

The Democrats adopted a platform at Chicago pledging a reduction of governmental expenditure, a balanced Budget, and a sound currency, the elimination of unnecessary Government activities, the curbing of bureaucracy, the break-down of monopolies, a general decentralization of government, the protection of the rights of the individual, and a revitalizing of the power of local governments. That program received the endorsement of the people of this country. I am ready to put the Republican Party on record as willing and able to do that which the Democratic Party promised in 1932 and have deliberately refused and signally failed to do.

The Republican Party must insist that the various agencies of this administration that stifle business, control labor, and dominate agriculture are to be but temporary agencies and not permanent. Whatever good there may be in them can be preserved through State and local agencies and machinery.

Our forefathers, but recently released from tyranny and despotism, guarded well the Government that they were building. But, as time went on, we came to feel secure. Generations that did not know despotism came into control; our people came to believe that because we had grown and prospered, that because liberty had been ours, it would continue unaided. We turned from giving thought to government to giving thought to everything but government. We became more interested in slogans and fantastic promises than in facts and principles of government.

Across the north entrance door of Nebraska's great capitol, carved in imperishable marble, are these words, "The safety of the State is in the watchfulness of the citizen." We need a revival of that watchfulness of the citizen.

Within the month that great American, Senator BORAH, said that the best way to oppose communism and fascism in America is to teach Americanism to our people, young and old, to encourage their study of economics and history, and to build in our citizenship an understanding of the principles of government upon which this Nation is founded. The Republican Party must lead these forces of an aroused and understanding public.

We need now to start with the field run of those who believe in the principles of the Republican Party, and in the 4,000 counties of this Nation strengthen and build from the ground up; and on that basis we can and should not only rebuild our organization but also from our basic membership secure the inspiration and

determine the position of the Republican Party on all issues before the American people. Party leadership and national organization must be subordinated to the demands and desires of our party membership. The party which believes that governments derive their power from the consent of the governed should strengthen its organization and secure its inspiration and authority for its leadership on that basis.

A democracy cannot long exist without an opposition party. The Republican Party has as great a responsibility out of power as in power. That responsibility is to give the people an understanding of the policies which are being urged or adopted. The public forum of the United States must be transferred from Washington to the country schoolhouse; from the Senate to the town hall; from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to the public press in every town of America. As now controlled, Congress is not an adequate forum. Witness the spectacle this month of the Speaker of the House forcing an adjournment because Members desired to exercise what should be a right—to express their views on vital public issues.

In and out of Congress and in every rural and urban community the Republican Party has voices to whom the people will listen. These voices must be brought into action in the day-to-day battle of opposition by a common citizenship to those measures which prompt the destruction of that system of government under which this Nation has grown.

On the average the western farmer is the greatest individualist in the United States. He believes in constitutional government and individual liberty. He wants to run his own business, to operate his own farm. He asks no special advantages; he asks only an even break with the rest of the citizenship of America. Depressions hit him first; recovery reaches him last. Eastern Republicans and Democrats alike refused for years to recognize the necessity of the solution of the agricultural problem as a national problem. Your common disturbance now has been caused in part by that distress we have had in the West for years. Various methods have been offered as a solution by western agriculturists. They have never been accepted.

The western farmer is not satisfied with the present program as a permanent program. You must aid us, under our leadership, to solve this problem upon the basis of assuring the farm population freedom from Government domination, direction and control of their industry, both in producing and marketing. Our farming population will not permanently submit to an economic structure, planned or otherwise, that does not give to them and their families a standard of living, a return for their labor and invested capital, and a comparative opportunity for cultural development equal to that received by labor and capital in the industries. That end will be achieved by aiding and encouraging cooperative marketing, directing the efforts of the Government toward increasing consumption rather than toward reducing production, and by protecting the right of the American farmer to supply America's needs from America's fields.

It would be well if some now in power in Washington would go to the battlefields of Lexington and Concord, live through the history of those battles, and there stand with bared head before the bronze statue of the embattled farmer, and in that presence receive a baptism of the spirit of those who built our America.

Tammany's political methods have been transplanted from New York City into every State in the Union. Tammany methods were used to control and win the election of 1934, including the direct and indirect benefits granted by the Federal Government by way of subsidies, payments, relief benefits, salaries to a horde of employees, and public improvements initiated and promised. In return, openly and unashamed, Democratic leaders, major and minor, demanded votes and got them.

We have now a proposal for the expenditure of $4,800,000,000 to give employment to persons on relief, a program obviously inadequate, for it promises nothing to the unemployed person who still manages to hold his head up and carry his own burden. It is a proposal to place the money, not in the hands of the President personally, but in the hands of an army of political employees, Democratic henchmen, machine politicians, all well trained in the Tammany art of controlling elections.

The program is not to be undertaken until July 1 of this year. We are assured that it will be in its full bloom of benefits to the country in the spring and summer of 1936. That means, first, that 2 years after this administration was swept into power it is still making promises and starting new programs to relieve distress and start recovery, admitting its others have not succeeded. It means, also, that in every State, county, city, and village in America Democracy's political machine will be in a position to effectively influence and to attempt to control the 1936 election by the expenditure of Government money. Three and a half million voters are to be added to the public pay roll. This $4,800,000,000 fund must be spent to relieve unemployment and to carry out the high purposes for which it is to be appropriated. It must not be permitted to become a $4,800,000,000 campaign fund for the Democratic Party in 1936. These three and a half million voters must be free to vote without compulsion or fear of loss of jobs. The Republican Party, in Congress and out, can serve a great purpose in trying to prevent the slimy hand of the spoilsman from controlling this fund and these votes. We should constantly, day after day, call it to the attention of the American people, to prevent the blighting effect which such misuse of public funds would have on the continuation of free government.

Abraham Lincoln was faced not only with the solution of the economic problems of a distracted people; but also, when civil war came and constitutional government was put to its supreme test, Abraham Lincoln insisted upon and rigidly followed a punctilious observance of constitutional methods, powers, and restrictions in his every act. Seventy-five years ago in this building he pled for the right of people everywhere to live their own lives and for the preservation of America's constitutional government. Let us here now face our problems with that same great purpose, that same great courage, and that same great confidence in and loyalty to our form of government that remained with him through those bitter years. Let us here dedicate ourselves again to that system of government for which he gave that last great "full measure of devotion."

Let us brush aside the accumulated debris of past contests and campaigns, freely admit our mistakes, adopt a forward-moving, liberal platform based on sound principles and not on an appeal to votes. Let us forego, if need be, temporary party gain for the permanent good of our common country. Let us follow those policies that experience shows bring the greatest good to the mass of our people, assure to them comfort and security without the loss of individual liberty in thought or word or deed. Let us fight the growth of dictatorship. Let us protect the rights of the States and strengthen local governments and preserve their proper functions. Let us recognize that legitimate prosperity can only result from individual thrift and industry and common honesty both by nations and individuals. Let us recognize that in private as well as in governmental affairs legitimate obligations must be met and promises kept. Let us recognize that with all of America's complex and ramified industrial, social, and religious life all of our people cannot be fitted into a common pattern down to the minute details of individual conduct and life and ruled by Government standards promulgated by the edict of Washington bureaucrats. Let us recognize the right of the individual citizen to live his own life in his own way, for that is the American way. Let us progress in America and continue to encourage the development of social policies and the solution of social problems, but do that without placing dominating power over the individual in a centralized Government in Washington. Let us expose and fight corruption wherever it occurs. Let us promote education, desire the advancement of religion, and aid in every proper governmental way the physical, mental, and moral development of the American people.

Under the leadership of those who believe in the principles of the Republican Party this Nation can and will again go forward and upward in the progress of a people working out the successful realization of our ideals of freedom of the individual under constitutional government. To furnish that leadership, outspoken, frank, and unafraid, is not only our supreme task but our supreme responsibility.

URGE RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION TO GIVE RELIEF TO DELINQUENT TAXPAYER

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a letter to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], who delivered an address on the floor yesterday.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD my letter to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], who delivered an address on the floor yesterday.

The letter is as follows:

FEBRUARY 1, 1935.

Hon. EMANUEL CELLER,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CELLER: I was very interested yesterday in your remarks concerning section 12 (a), wherein authorization was to have been given to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make loans "to any institution the business of which is that of lending money to taxpayers at an interest rate not exceeding 4 percent per annum, plus a service charge of not in excess of 2 percent, for the payment of real-estate taxes, water rates, or special assessments on real estate, against the security of tax liens, or any interest therein held by the taxing authority", and was equally sorry to learn that no such provision was to be found in the Senate bill, and that the conferees accordingly eliminated this provision.

Your assurance, however, as a member of the Judiciary Committee, that this relief measure would be forthcoming in the form of a new bill, will indeed be encouraging news to the thousands of property owners throughout this country, and especially in my home city, Detroit, where income from property during the past years has not been sufficient to meet the ordinary expenses of property, such as taxes, insurance, waters bills, and repairs.

I am in hearty accord, and will enthusiastically support such a proposed measure, but feel that it should give further relief to the taxpayer than that which is set forth in the original proposal. The further relief I suggest should reduce the high interest rates and penalties now assessed against the property of the delinquent taxpayer (as to interest and penalties on past-due taxes) to an amount not to exceed a maximum of 6 percent per annum, this maximum rate covering both interest and penalty, to be set by the bill as a controlling factor to govern those cities, towns, municipalities, counties, etc., deriving the benefits of relief from such proposed legislation.

I write you in the interest of the many people of my district and city suffering through no fault of their own, and who are being penalized by these excessive charges over which your bill would have control. The cities, too, would be fortunate in receiving the huge sums that naturally would come to them under this proposed legislation.

It is my hope that your recommendation on this matter will contain the suggestion herein made.

With kind personal regards, I am,

Yours very truly,

LOUIS C. RABAUT.

NATIONAL DEFENSE—REORGANIZATION OF DEPARTMENTAL CONTROL

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the subject of national defense, and to include extracts from a recent address by Maj. Gen. James G. Harbord.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Speaker, national defense is a composite idea and has many aspects and angles and problems and, necessarily, a large number of instrumentalities to accomplish national defense. It is not only the traditional policy of America, stated in numerous State papers of Presidents and Secretaries of State, that our armed forces upon land and sea and in the air are merely for defense, but it is the solemn and sincere resolution of the hearts of the men and the women of this whole Nation, that this American Republic, dedicated to the principles of human liberty, shall never engage in a war of aggression.

We have a huge continent still undeveloped in a large measure, and easily capable of supporting a population five times as numerous as our present population. Within this continental area we have every variety of soil and resource, so that we are self-sufficient; and if other nations will let us alone, then we will let them alone. The economic urge will never be sufficient to drive us beyond our own frontiers in the effort to take possession of the lands of other peoples. It may be that a very small group here and there of selfish internationalists, seeking to enlarge unduly their already swollen fortunes, would grasp for their private purposes the mineral resources, the oil resources, the forest resources, and, perhaps, the soil resources of certain parts of other lands; but these small groups are infinitesimal, and they do not either speak or reflect the deliberate conviction of the great masses of our people, who, believing in the proposition of "America for Americans", also accord to the peoples of other nations the same right to enjoy their own blessings undisturbed by any selfish aggravation from us.

NATIONAL DEFENSE IS ALL COMPREHENDING

Consequently, Mr. Speaker, a true conception of national defense would deal not only with land forces, such as troops in our Army and the various weapons used by land forces, but also deal with every form and kind of defensive force and weapon and agency, whether operating upon the surface of the sea or under the sea, as in the case of submarines, and in the air, whether by heavier-than-air craft or lighter-than-air craft. This same conception of national defense may ultimately include the forces of radio activity. Consequently, when we speak of the National Defense Act, which by a limited conception of the nature of national defense was applied to the Army only, we have unduly restricted the thought, and have not comprehended every factor entering into an adequate national defense. Furthermore, a proper national defense would include not only fighting forces and the weapons employed by fighting forces, but every internal economic organization and industrial center, and should also include certain external activities, such as diplomatic agencies of our country, in seeking to make and confirm friendships with the peoples of other lands and exercising every wise and prudent influence to assuage and ameliorate enmities, jealousies, and envies against us that may grow up among the peoples based upon a misconception of the true attitude of the great-hearted, altruistic, and humanitarian masses of America.

THE THREEFOLD FORCES OF DEFENSE

Let us now consider the forces and agencies at present necessary to accomplish adequate national defense and operating in (a) the air, (b) upon the water, and (c) upon the land. I submit that I have arranged these agencies in the order of their actual present importance and priority, and I further submit, with much confidence, that developments in the next few years will be such as to convince any and all who may now hold a contrary view that this is now the true order of importance among our defense agencies. Looking back into the history of the human race we find that wars were originally restricted to combat between land forces exclusively; but gradually the ancient peoples, having learned something about the construction of boats and the navigation thereof upon the seas, especially upon such a land-locked body of water as the Mediterranean Sea, began to employ boats as agencies of warfare, either of defense or of aggression, as the case might be. Finally Greece came to realize that the language of the oracle was correct in saying that her best defense would consist of "wooden walls." This had reference to ships, small though they were, propelled by oars and with very slow speed, limited range, and low carrying power. Despite the inadequacy of these early ships, they could move far more rapidly, and therefore proved far more effective, than the armaments moving but a few miles a day by marching upon the ground. These ships were especially valuable in battle because of their mobility and their capacity to present themselves at every point of approach by the enemy if such enemy had to come over water, however narrow the intervening water might be. These ships could carry the war into the enemy's country. They could cross great rivers, straits, bays, gulfs, and even narrow seas, and attack the seaports and coast cities and towns of the enemy country, and especially cut off enemy sources of supply, raid enemy commerce, and compel an enemy not supplied with naval strength equal to the aggressive nation to submit to harsh terms and conditions of peace.

WAR METHODS CHANGE WITH THE ADVANCE OF SCIENCE

As mankind made progress in the arts in the mastery over Nature, eventually sailing ships appeared and supplanted the galleys of Greece and Rome, for the simple reason that such sailing ships could move more swiftly, carry larger fighting crews and greater cargoes, and transport larger numbers of land troops to attack the enemy land forces.

The defect of these sailing ships was obviously their dependence upon the presence of wind and the direction of wind, although this was partially overcome, as explained in the language of the poet, "Some ships sail east and some sail west, while the self-same breezes blow."

HARD TO GIVE UP THE SHIP

Many decisive and spectacular battles influencing the course of history and affecting the lives of nations and the fortunes of dynasties were fought from sailing ships, and so impressive were these victories that many of the old school of admirals thought that none could ever advance beyond the ships and the tactics of Nelson and the other great sea fighters of his class. Consequently, they were slow to confess that boats propelled by steam could ever be effective in fighting. The progress of science and invention could not be stopped by the reactionary and self-sufficient thinking of the old admiralty authorities. Finally steam did supplant the "wooden walls" and the canvas sails, and, ultimately, these "wooden walls", even within the lifetime of a few persons now living, yielded to the logic of "steel walls." There was a lot of romance clinging around those old ships, with every sail spread to the breezes and the pictures and paintings of those craft now adorn the walls of many who love the traditions of the sea. But the *Merrimac* steamed among the old wooden craft and forever crushed in the heartless mill of fact the sentiment that clung about those beautiful sailboats.

Progress continued until coal as a fuel yielded to oil, and perhaps within the lifetime of many of us now living oil as a fuel for the steam engine will be supplanted by some form of internal-combustion engine, such as the Diesel engine. When this shall have been accomplished, can any man in the light of history's lessons and comprehending the possibilities of scientific development say that the last word has yet been spoken in the construction of surface fighting craft? Will

surface ships never yield to the more effective and more economical agencies operating upon the surface, concealed by the water, or operating in great altitudes of air, possessing power to climb more than 10 miles high and course with a speed of 300 miles an hour, all now within the realm of accomplished fact?

The wise and prudent industrialist, being compelled by economic laws to manufacture goods in the most effective and economical manner, is constantly seeking to make application of the latest developments of science, the leaders of industry, the heads of great manufacturing establishments who fail to keep abreast of the latest progress in science and in art soon drop into discard and bury themselves and their businesses in the waves of bankruptcy.

Why did the galleys prove superior to even the powerful Greek phalanx and the Roman legion, those trained and disciplined land troops? Was it not because of the greater speed and mobility and range of the boat moving within the yielding element of water? The lessons of history, pointing and proving this powerful truth, are forcibly and graphically described by Admiral Mahan in his brilliant work, first appearing in 1889, under the title of "The Influence of Seapower Upon History." Suppose Admiral Mahan were living today. In 1889 neither Admiral Mahan nor any other person then living could foretell what would take place on December 23, 1903, when Wilbur Wright and Orville Wright first demonstrated that man could construct a craft that would rise by its own power into the air and could be guided and controlled by a human pilot and landed back upon mother earth with greater certainty than could even the old sailboats when they set out be sure of returning to the home port at a given time. Admiral Mahan and his contemporaries could not foresee that the Wright brothers would make the age-old dream of man come true. Through all the ages men have enviously watched birds fly, and though men had imitated by machinery every form of animal locomotion upon the surface of the earth he had not been able to accomplish mechanical locomotion in the air. And yet the common sense of mankind said that it could be done. It said that the mere instinct of birds, being an evolution of countless generations of creatures that felt the necessity for self-preservation and to gain a livelihood to climb into the air could not ultimately be greater than the scientific accomplishments of the brain of civilized man. Greek mythology, even thousands of years ago, relates the fiction of man's imagining that Daedalus affixed wings to his body with wax and accomplished flights so high that the sun melted the wax and left the foolish adventurer to drop to his death.

APPLY ADMIRAL MAHAN'S LOGIC TO PRESENT CONDITIONS

Suppose that Admiral Mahan could have foreseen that a mighty flying boat would move with a speed 10 times as great as the fastest ship that he ever knew up to 1889, and could mount miles high into the air, and could go out at least a thousand miles from its land base, over either land or sea, and could from its dizzy heights drop with marvelous accuracy tons of explosives upon enemy ships, or enemy cities, or enemy bases of supplies, or enemy concentration of land troops, and then could return to its base, unless sooner shot down by another flying boat sent out by the enemy. What do you think that Admiral Mahan would have said to that? What conclusions would Admiral Mahan have drawn as to the influence of such a flying boat upon the destiny of nations? When we realize that this flying boat can be multiplied by thousands and that 1,000 of such flying boats can be built at the cost of a single sea-surface battleship, then we get some conception of what such a scientific and military philosopher as Admiral Mahan would think about this mighty instrumentality of warfare.

READJUSTMENT IS THE LAW OF PROGRESS

I venture my belief that Admiral Mahan would advise his countrymen that it would be no longer safe to depend upon "wooden walls" or "steel walls", but that his America, pursuing her policy of diplomatic isolation and possessing all her mighty resources of wealth and power, should place her chief and primary reliance upon these great agencies of aircraft, both lighter-than-air and heavier-than-air.

HOW HABIT ENSLAVES MAN'S THINKING

Unfortunately, history shows another fact that must be taken into account in this problem. This other fact is that with most people habits of thought acquired in early life and in school, when taught by great minds regarded by youth as the masters of all truth, are more controlling upon the conduct of people than habits of conduct themselves. In other words, thinking controls action, and many now in places of power were taught to believe that the sea fighters of the generation of Admiral Mahan and the land fighters of the generation of Lee and Grant, or even of Dewey and Sampson and Schley and Shafter, were the last word in military truth, and that the bold and presumptuous innovations of a later day could never even partially supplant the weapons and tactics then employed. Can we not come down even a little nearer to the present time? Can we not say that those who formed their habits of military thinking in the school even of Foch and of Haig and of Hindenburg, when aircraft was almost in its infancy and available almost exclusively for observation, cannot now reconstruct their thinking in the light of the developments of this day, and therefore cannot, or will not, admit what I believe Admiral Mahan would have cheerfully admitted, namely, that if a flying boat can soar through the air 10 times as fast as a surface sea craft and rise almost to invisible heights and carry tons of death-dealing explosives, then such craft would bear the same relative superiority to sea-surface craft as has been demonstrated sea-surface craft bears to land forces moving upon their feet with hardly one-tenth the speed of battleships.

Those who acquired habits of thinking as to military forces and practices before the accomplishment of the Wright brothers, and even those who obtained their conception of military agencies when aviation was in its infancy, seem now to be unable to construct a new mental equation and to introduce the new and mightly factor of powerful and swift aircraft.

THE CONSERVATIVE MIND OF PROFESSIONAL SOLDIERS

We recall the words of Lloyd George with reference to fixity of thinking of the professional military mind. We civilians do not presume to know the niceties of military organization and details of administration that the trained soldier knows. We are not presumed to understand the problems of tactics and of logistics as the trained soldier knows them, because he has devoted much of his life to their study; but the mind of the civilian who is open to the lessons of history, who comprehends the possibility of scientific development, who sees with unblinked vision what is going on about us this very day, and can make a practical application of these great forces to the inevitable fight for national defense, surely such civilians are not to be discounted as irresponsible dreamers.

THE WARNINGS OF ARTHUR BRISBANE

Some of these ultraconservative professional soldiers and sailors scoff at the manifest truths that are proclaimed in thunder tones by Arthur Brisbane. Some of these professional authorities upon warfare, whether on land or on sea, have never been in the air even as passengers to understand, even in that slight way, what superiority these swift and powerful fighting planes, in the hands of pilots trained by flying officers who are giving their lives to the development of the tactics of air warfare, possess as destructive agencies in war and, therefore, possess as very powerful instrumentalities in the accomplishment of our national defense.

THAT SHIFTING FIRST LINE OF DEFENSE

A generation ago there was formulated the phrase that "the Navy is the first line of defense." That statement is still being pronounced and proclaimed by many as a fundamental fact in the problem of national defense. But what is the Navy? The Navy, in the conception of Admiral Mahan, consists of a group of boats called "a fleet." Now, those who believe what Admiral Mahan believed in his day, namely,

that the fleet is the first line of defense and that fleets have been the most powerful agencies influencing the course of history and the destiny of nations, have realized that to make these fleets themselves secure and to make them effective as fighting agencies they must be supplemented by another fleet, and not a fleet of boats such as Admiral Mahan conceived, but a fleet of flying boats, basing upon sea-surface boats and operating from thence for the defense not only of the country, but for the defense of the surface Navy itself.

SURFACE SHIPS AND LAND FORCES STILL NECESSARY

I would not be understood as saying that we can dispense with a fleet or fleets of surface craft by no means. The progress of science does not abrogate any particular weapon of warfare, but rather multiplies the number of fighting agencies. The surface fleet is necessary, but, I submit, with great diffidence and with great respect for those who may differ from me that the surface fleet would be powerless and defenseless and helpless without an air fleet to accompany it.

HOW HARD TO MODIFY EARLY TEACHING

I have known some old soldiers of great distinction and of splendid service who got their training before flying was accomplished, and who still think of warfare in terms of marching men only. These great, old soldiers ignore even the powerful factors of trucks and tractors and tanks. They still like to think of charging squadrons of cavalry with sabers raised high; they still like to think of artillery rushing upon the battlefield drawn by six horses and unlimbering in full sight of the enemy. They view with uncomprehending eye and, perhaps, even with hostile and jealous eye, the fact that charging cavalry and horse-drawn artillery would be the most vulnerable instrumentalities possible in the light of present-day machine guns and high-powered automatic rifles, numerous 1-pounders, and long-distance artillery firing from concealed positions, and obtaining their range by radio from observer pilots in the air. Still a few officers of an older generation, long since retired, have retained pliability of mind sufficient to understand the mastering influence of air power, as witness Lt. Gen. Robert Lee Bullard. It is gratifying to note the progress that is being made in military thinking along these lines. A belief, a conviction in the supremacy of air power is rapidly possessing the thinking of military leaders, as it long ago impressed many forward-looking civilians.

GREAT PROGRESS AMONG MILITARY MINDS

The superiority of air-fighting craft moving hither and thither with mighty speed over land and sea, however high and rough the mountains, and however high and angry the ocean's billows, is gradually being forced upon the thinking of all men charged in any degree with responsibility for our national defense. I repeat that we dare not think of dispensing with land troops and surface ships. These must be increased in numbers and in effectiveness, and their organizations must be perfected. I know that air power alone is insufficient to defend this Nation, but I believe with solemn conviction that the first line of defense from now henceforth, until perhaps some other great agency of destruction, such as radio activity, may be discovered, shall be in the air, just as prior to this time, the first line of defense was on the surface of the sea. We must have our lines of defense instantly ready to take to the air and go far out beyond every point of our 9,000 miles of frontier. We must ultimately have for war use numerous airships that can maintain their stations in the air almost indefinitely to keep a constant lookout for the approach of enemy aircraft from every possible direction. From these high observation posts information as to the movement of, the direction of, and the number of approaching enemy aircraft can be radioed back to the air forces grouped upon their bases along our frontiers, and then these argosies of the air can rise and go out to meet the enemy air fleets that would be seeking to destroy our cities, our centers of supply and of munitions, and trying to break the morale of our people and to destroy their will to fight and to defend our Nation.

NEW CONDITIONS TEACH NEW LESSONS

I am speaking only of the relative importance of air forces and of sea forces and of land forces in formulating the machinery of national defense, and of national defense only. Long ago our people realized, with Admiral Mahan, what was then the superiority of the Navy as an agency of defense. Then we had to organize and maintain a Navy, always too small but constantly growing stronger, to hold back the approach of enemy fleets and transports toward our shores, so that there might not be again repeated what happened in August 1814, when an enemy fleet landed its troops on the shores of Chesapeake Bay and marched overland to Washington and destroyed the Capitol Building and the White House and our then young Capital City, all emblems of the power and the sovereignty of this then young Republic.

MAHAN'S TEACHING BROUGHT UP TO DATE

Just as in the days of Admiral Mahan, we needed a Navy to check and hold back and thus prevent invasion by the enemy until our land forces could be assembled and ready to repel the first enemy troops that should place their feet upon American soil, so today we must have our mighty fleet of the air, able to be shifted from one side of the continent to the other in a few hours and able to rush hither or thither, as the information may come through the mysterious agency of ether, to tell what must ultimately be our great Headquarters Air Force where and when the enemy is approaching.

TO REFUSE PROGRESS IS TO COURT DEFEAT

The Army upon the land which neglects to avail itself of the developments of scientific progress is courting certain defeat. The Army that would now depend upon the support of horse-drawn field artillery and of scouting cavalry and of fighting cavalry, such as did the armies of Lee on the one side and of Grant on the other side, would be just as sure to meet defeat as would an army equipped with pikes and crossbows only in the face of rifle and cannon.

The land army must be motorized to move more swiftly, to be set free from the vulnerable transporting agencies of the horse, and must be mechanized to hurl its missiles of death and destruction with greater speed and power and distance, in order to be able to accomplish its mission as one of the three great factors in our national defense.

REORGANIZATION OF DEFENSE ADMINISTRATION

I will enter only briefly into the discussion of what conclusions these facts must bring to the scientific and logical mind as to the proper organization of all defensive agencies. Most of the professional soldiers and sailors of high command still declare with great energy and, of course, with sincere conviction that the present organization of an army upon the land and of a navy upon the sea, each separate and distinct, each with a separate department, and each with a representative in the President's Cabinet, is the ideal organization for national defense.

Those who support these views insist that air force is but an auxiliary of the land forces on the one hand and of the surface sea forces on the other. They fail to recognize the almost self-evident fact that aircraft, which moves 10 times as swiftly as sea-surface craft and a hundred times as fast as land forces, must be certainly of a very high degree of efficiency in warfare. They admit that there is a justification for separation of the land forces and surface sea forces. They predicate this classification upon the fact that there is a difference between land and water, and that troops marching upon the land or moving and fighting upon the land should have a different department in the governmental organization from troops moving and fighting in vessels propelled upon the surface of the sea. If this classification and distinction is sound, then with far greater force must it ultimately be argued by those in Congress and in the country, charged with responsibility of setting up by law that organization most effectively accomplishing national defense, and by those in civil life who pay the taxes and who foot the bill, now fast approaching a billion dollars a year, for the maintenance of these defense forces, that the instrumentalities operating in the air are of necessity so distinct and different from land forces and surface sea forces as to justify a separate organization, a separate and distinct system of training and fighting, and a separate rep-

resentation in the Cabinet of the President, who, under the Constitution, is the Commander in Chief of all fighting forces seeking to accomplish the national defense, whether these forces fight upon the land, or upon the sea, or under the sea, or in the air, and, if in the air, whether in lighter-than-air or heavier-than-air craft.

SINGLE DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENSE

But, Mr. Speaker, disclaiming any qualification to advise upon technical organization and training and fighting, whether upon land or upon the sea, yet claiming the right to exercise the authority reposed in one as a Member of Congress, charged upon his oath with the duty of accomplishing national defense by the most effective and most economical ways and means, I venture to offer my conviction that, ultimately, the logic of this situation will force upon the minds of the Members of Congress—perhaps not of this Congress, perhaps not of the next Congress, but, ultimately, upon the minds of some future Congress—the conclusion that all the fighting forces of the Nation, organized solely for the defense of the Nation, in order to accomplish economy, in order to accomplish effective cooperation in training and in fighting, must be under a single authority, and in a single department, such as might be described by the words "department of national defense", and presided over by a single secretary with appropriate under secretaries.

SUPERMAN NOT NECESSARY TO BE SECRETARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE

I am well aware of the oft-repeated argument that no single man has the ability, the power, and the experience sufficient to be the secretary of such single department of national defense, but I am also aware of the argument advanced by those who support the present dual division of our national forces, that when there is conflict of interest, when there is jealousy, rivalry, and envy among the two services, when they fail to cooperate in accomplishing economy in peace and efficiency in training and effectiveness in war, then the President, as the Commander in Chief, can and must, and will step in to become, in that instance, the secretary of the single department of defense and command by his single will both the Army and the Navy. Those who support this view fail to recognize that its weakness rests upon the fact that the President is seldom a man with any military experience and that he is certainly never elected upon the basis of his equipment as a military man, but is elected upon political and economic issues. Furthermore, under the present system, when there is lack of cooperation or harmony between the War Department and the Navy Department, the President is extremely reluctant to decide a controversy as between the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy.

To decide in favor of one would constitute such a reflection upon the other that it would force his resignation and thereby bring about a Cabinet crisis. The President should not, therefore, be charged with the responsibility of settling these disputed details growing out of mutual jealousies and rivalries. The President should have one single Cabinet officer who would be his adviser upon the whole problem of national defense. In such a case the Congress and the public sentiment of the country would demand that he select to be secretary of national defense a man of great ability, experience, and vision. Under such an organization there would be unity of command running from the top to the bottom of every fighting organization in our Nation. When the secretary of national defense spoke he would speak as the deputy commander in chief. If such deputy commander in chief proved incompetent and unfit, the President could and would replace him and him alone, without bringing on a Cabinet crisis.

THREE COORDINATE DIVISIONS OF A SINGLE DEPARTMENT

Then, ultimately, there would be forced upon the Congress, which is charged with setting up by law our fighting agencies and with supplying the money to maintain them, by the very logic of the situation, the conclusion that we would have one form of organization for the land fighting forces, another form of organization for the sea surface fighting forces, and another form of organization for the air fighting forces, and that all three of these must be subordinated to a single minister of war, the secretary of national defense; and that they will be compelled by law and by the command of this single will to cooperate in business matters, and in training in time of peace, and to cooperating in fighting in time of war.

It cannot be said that a man of sufficient ability cannot be found among all our 130,000,000 citizens to be secretary of national defense. We select the President by popular vote, and those who argue for the maintenance of the existing establishments say that this President, thus chosen, is able to exercise unity of command to compel cooperation between the Army and the Navy in peace and in war. That argument, while theoretically sound, is, as a matter of fact, in view of what we see taking place every day, and what we know has taken place in our lifetime, to be actually unsound. We know there is jealousy and envy between the Army and the Navy; we know that their joint boards have not functioned as they should, because they try to function by mutual consent; we know that they have been compelled in recent years by the force of popular sentiment and by the logic of events, to set up certain boards for cooperation; and every such board constitutes a confession that, instead of being two independent agencies cooperating by mutual consent and comity, they ought to be under a single administration, and subject to the will of a single, responsible Cabinet officer. Such able men are to be found, capable of being secretary of national defense. Such a man in the early days was John C. Calhoun; such a man—in his prime—is Elihu Root; such a man was Dwight W. Morrow; such a man was John W. Weeks. I hesitate to mention the names of men now living who possess, as I believe, the amplest experience, the broadest practical judgment, the greatest natural ability, and that profound knowledge of history, sufficient to enable them to function as secretary of national defense to the great credit of themselves, to the greatest saving to the Treasury, and to the promotion of the greatest efficiency of all of our fighting forces, whether upon land or upon sea or in the air.

There has been called to my attention by the Honorable J. Mayhew Wainwright, formerly Assistant Secretary of War, and formerly an honored and useful Member of this House of Representatives, an address delivered by Maj. Gen. James Harbord, United States Army, retired, on January 3, 1935, at the Town Hall and before the Civic Forum and League for Political Education, in New York City. I have found the reading of this address very suggestive and stimulating, and I am therefore appending it, with the consent of the House, as a part of my remarks in order that it may become thus available to the Members of the Congress and to the people of the whole country.

[From the Civic Forum and the League for Political Education at the Town Hall, 123 West Forty-third Street, New York City]

AGAIN WE DREAM WHILE CLOUDS GATHER

(Address by Gen. James G. Harbord in Civic Forum series, Town Hall, Jan. 3, 1935)

It is 16 years since the bells rang out and the whistles shrieked the achievement of a great peace. After 4 years of war on a scale of which Napoleon never dreamed, there was to be a peace such as the world had never known before. "A war to end wars" had been the battle cry of millions of men. Faith in the accomplishment of that high ideal deepened the flush on the faces of the returning soldiers who marched up Fifth Avenue. The hope of it had quickened the last heartbeats of many who did not return.

Today the bells and deep-toned sirens no longer sound in tribute to peace. Instead, throughout an uneasy world, hammers ring against the steel of armaments. The shrill whistles of drill sergeants can be heard by those who listen closely. But our country does not listen closely. She is dreaming again, as she was in 1914. It is true that but once in her peaceful history has she fought in Europe. But that history repeats itself is based upon many centuries of unchanging human nature.

While she dreams, the causes which drove her irresistibly toward that former conflict—for which she was so ill prepared—are stronger than ever. They are incessantly spurred by the world-wide economic situation. If the world was too small for the United States to remain neutral in 1917, think of its comparative size today. The globe has been shrunken into a neighborhood by the increased speed of communications and the greater dependence of nations upon one another.

The United States insists she shall have unhampered passage upon the oceans of this contracting world. Freedom of the seas is an offspring of the doctrine of neutrality. It is a principle of our foreign policy enshrined in our history. As a nation of 5,000,000 people, Americans fought for it in the past; and as a nation of 124,000,000 they may some day think it worth fighting for again.

Other great maritime powers hold exactly the opposite view. "In war", they say firmly, "the neutral flag may—and frequently does—protect enemy property." The view was expressed with characteristic forcefulness and clarity by William Pitt, one of the greatest statesmen who ever spoke our tongue. In 1801 he described freedom of the seas as a monstrous and unheard of principle by which an enemy is insured against the effects of your own hostility.

That pronouncement practically sums up the attitude of the maritime powers of today. While the passing of 134 years has many times multiplied the volume of our ocean traffic, the idea Pitt expressed survives unchanged in the minds of many statesmen. The freedom of the seas was not won by President Wilson at Versailles. In any important future war belligerents will instantly look to America as a source for munitions and supplies. We will demand our right to respond to the extreme limit of our neutrality with any goods not contraband. Adverse belligerents will cling to the right of capture, the right of blockade, jurisdiction of their own prize courts, and national control of their strategic maritime localities. Our shipping will be in the same difficulties as in the troubled years between 1914 and 1918. The climax will come no less, and perhaps even more swiftly.

The vast resources of the United States which lull into a false sense of security are among the most potent factors which might lead to embroilment in international controversies. A granary needs more watchmen than a poorhouse. Our country is the wealthiest on the earth in food supplies, metals, oil, manufactures, and agricultural products, and will never cease to attract envious eyes in a world in which nations struggle for economic advantage. Its treasure is equal to half that of all the other six great powers combined. In 1932 the National Industrial Conference Board estimated our national wealth to be $247,300,000,000. Most of this is concentrated within our continental limits. The largest part of our industrial assets are centered in the Northeast and the Great Lakes region.

Our country is rich not only in material assets, but also—more doubtfully—in promissory notes. A stupendous amount is owed us by foreign countries. On January 4, 1934, our Government had on its books official obligations of other nations totalling more than $12,710,000,000. All except $416,000,000 of that was coming from European countries—if we use the word "coming" in the very loose way of meaning still due. About one-third was owed by Great Britain, our heaviest debtor and our greatest commercial competitor. Stated in another way, every individual American has a stake of $1,012 in our governmental loans abroad. Payments are in default in nearly all cases.

Settlement negotiations have failed repeatedly. Nonpayment of war debts is about the only issue on which practically all Europe seems to be in complete accord. In America public opinion runs in the other direction. Notwithstanding our Government's attitude on its gold coupons American citizens generally have the old-fashioned notion that debtors should make good their word. We are not willing to cancel. There is not much we can do about it, except hope. If this stupendous sum were due from one country, we could, and probably would, bring effective pressure to bear. This indebtedness looms as a conflict of interests—with its own possibilities. No one loves us more because he owes us money.

Besides these governmental debts abroad, we have foreign investments, direct and portfolio, which reach a larger total than the so-called "war debts." Thirteen billion seven hundred and ninety-nine millions in such investments are about evenly distributed in Canada, South America, and Europe, with smaller amounts in Africa and the Far East. In those countries where returns on our private loans are in default, we are proceeding cautiously. It is our policy, as in the case of the war debts, not to stir up trouble. Our ultimate interests seem to be best served in this way at present. Yet the hard fact remains that our industry, trade, and prosperity are—to the extent of more than $13,000,000,000—bound up in other countries. We are interested in keeping the peace, for this reason. But a war in which any of those countries went to pieces would mean material loss to us. It would make it harder for us to stand idly by and smile a disinterested international smile.

Then there is our foreign commerce. In 1931 the United States had 11.5 percent of the world's total trade, ranking next to the British Commonwealth of Nations, which had 23.7 percent. It is true that the amount of our goods consumed at home always has far outshadowed our exports. Even in the peak year of 1929 our exports were but 9.8 percent of our total production. This holds out the possibility of following a purely nationalistic policy, if that should be to our best interests.

The trouble is that policy becomes increasingly less adequate to our interests. More than 100 years ago Washington, soldier of the successful Revolution, looked forward to an entirely self-supporting America, going its own way serenely in safe and glorious isolation. Wise as he was, he could not have dreamed of the new era of mechanical invention that was soon to dawn; that rapid transportation and telegraphic contact by radio and cable would make isolation impossible, and that America would be compelled to take a part in world affairs. The increase of our exports by four times their value in the last 30 years is one of the manifestations of this new day. That increase will continue.

A great sea and air traffic is being developed in the service of this trade. American owned and operated ships now ply practically all important routes from the United States to the principal ports of the world. They carry about 31 percent of the total dry cargoes of our foreign ocean commerce. The gross tonnage of our merchant marine is approximately twice what it was in 1914. Although the sea-borne commerce of our country was accelerated by the war, it originated long before Europe was thrown into turmoil by the murder of an Austrian archduke inspecting a little city in the Balkans. Its expansion is closely linked with our industrial growth. The steady increase in the manufacture of new units even in the depression shows that under private ownership American shipping can and will compete with vessels under foreign flags. An effect from this upon our foreign responsibilities is unavoidable.

Extensions of air lines from the United States to foreign points grew from 152 miles in 1926 to 22,790 miles in 1934. The carrying of passengers, express, freight, and mail along these sky lanes has introduced a problem in international relations unknown 10 years ago. In an American passenger plane flying over the border between Uruguay and Argentina bound for Brazil a Frenchman is murdered by a Swede. Who takes jurisdiction in the case?

Such are some physical and economic factors containing seeds of potential discord which may take root if subjected to enough heat. If our outlook is to extend to a national life not limited to our own boundaries, we cannot disassociate ourselves from the repercussions of world affairs. International commitments by which our foreign policy is guided are less tangible, but are nevertheless pregnant with possibilities. So long as treaties are made by the President by and with the consent of the Senate, provided two-thirds of the Senators present shall concur, our foreign policy will be apt to reflect the will of the majority of our people. It will be hesitant at times and inconsistent at others, but trampling upon it will rouse to anger our usually apathetic countrymen. From the American viewpoint on international obligations, treaties are not mere scraps of paper.

I already have spoken of freedom of the seas as a principle for which the United States has fought, and still cherishes as worth fighting for. The Monroe Doctrine is another one. The present tendency is to interpret the Monroe Doctrine as an understanding between ourselves and other nations denying them any right of intervention in Latin American countries. We thus become in a sense the guarantors of non-American rights in Central and South America. Between us and Latin America countries the Doctrine is currently interpreted as an understanding for cooperation against any non-American threat, with an agreement against intervention by force in any case.

The danger of armed European aggression in South America probably has disappeared. It has been replaced by a peaceful penetration through trade and by European colonization. Are South American economic interests and ours so mutual and complementary that they would not permit the formation of powerful groups or interests, antagonistic to our trade and consequently hostile to us as a result of such peaceful penetration? Our present liberal attitude could hardly be expected to stand the strain of hostility toward us, fostered by foreign influence in any of the large South American countries.

Our policy of nonrecognition of territorial changes in the Orient resulting from armed action, enumerated by Secretary Stimson, was early adopted by the present administration and seems to have been generally approved in America and also in European nations. It appears to commit us as favoring the territorial status quo, even though that status quo, itself, resulted from force in the past. The avowed programs of Nazi Germany and the militant Fascists also are against it. Freezing European frontiers will be serious for at least a hundred years after the Treaty of Versailles. For the future the point we must keep in mind is that any attempted territorial changes in Europe will cause invaded nations to call on us for a statement of our position. We appear to have definitely alined ourselves for boundaries as they now exist.

About our right to control immigration and exclude certain immigrants there is no more doubt in the mind of the average American than there is in regard to freedom of the seas, the Monroe Doctrine, and the nonrecognition of territorial changes by force. Our immigration law, especially if ungraciously enforced, does not add to the number of our friends.

When Americans go abroad on peaceful errands they expect the protection of their Government, and it rightly assumes the obligation. At the beginning of last year 429,209 Americans were living in other countries. Half of them were in western Canada; about 100,000 were in Europe; and the remainder were distributed fairly equally among Mexico, South America, the West Indies, and Asia. Protection of this group parallels to a great extent the protection accorded our foreign commerce. Many in it represent American business and trade.

Almost any kind of an American will agree that our citizens should be permitted to travel freely on the seas and in foreign countries, enjoying the same privileges that are granted citizens of other countries. We insist on our right of "open door" accessibility to sources of raw material and world markets, subject to the reserved rights of each nation. Finally, we expect to invest our money and conduct our business abroad under a safeguard from foreign laws equal to that granted other nationals.

This brief summary of a few of the influences at work is ample evidence that through her vast resources, her commerce, her war debts, foreign investments, and her policies, the United States is in a give-and-take relationship with a restless world, no matter how aloof she may wish to be. A glance at a few obvious facts will show just how restless that world is.

The last few months have seen several armed conflicts. Bolivia has fought with Paraguay over the Gran Chaco oil resources. France has completed her conquest of Morocco. There has been revolution and civil war in Spain. Japan has fought against China, and China has fought not only the Japanese but her own Communists.

There have been threats of war in half a dozen disagreements: Italy with Jugoslavia over the freedom of the Adriatic; between France and Germany over the Saar and other differences; Russia against Poland and Germany over the Ukraine; Japan with Russia over control of the northeast Asiatic coast; Japan and China for control of North China; Jugoslavia against Hungary for the murder of their king.

All the great nations of Europe are engaged in the economic struggle for protection of their own industries and the suppression of alien competition. The British Empire and Japan are contesting for empire and world markets. We can only hope that the present balance of antagonistic forces in Europe can be maintained until a leader appears who can negotiate satisfactory settlements. The hope grows dimmer with every passing month. Before such a leader appears one of the sparks caused by the constant friction may fall into the powder. Fears of war are born in Europe. There rusts and corrodes the key to world peace, while the nations bicker.

With the possible results of violent collisions between nationalistic ambitions we are only too familiar from the long and sad experience of the past. Under the troubled surface throughout the world today, however, a new foment bubbles. It spills over beyond national boundaries to imperil continued peace. Nearly every country is seething with social unrest.

Fascism, socialism, and communism are rival philosophies of government each carrying its own dangers to the institutions for which the United States has fought since the days of the American Revolution. All these "isms" believe that democracy has served its purpose and is on the way out. All join in criticizing our national institutions. They bore into us from without and from within. While small groups in our country clamor for more radical methods, we are frankly experimenting with the redistribution of political, social, and economic power. Those who are anxious that such experiments may go on, presumably under the aegis of the Constitution, may find it vital to be able to defend them from outside interference.

Such are some of the sour notes which catch the ear now, jangling out of tune in the great world orchestra. How much chance is there that we can write a new score on clean white paper and change this discordant hubbub into a swelling symphony of peace? The best way to decide the odds in favor of that consummation, so devoutly to be wished, is to consider the results of efforts that have been made for international agreements. The futility of expecting peace through solemn pledges alone is well illustrated by what has followed the Briand-Kellogg and the Nine-Power Pacts.

By the former agreement all nations renounced war as an instrument of national policy. Since that great dramatic renunciation the expenditures and organization of practically every large nation—for nonaggressive self-defense, of course—have increased rapidly. Germany, France, Italy, Japan, Russia, and England are all better prepared to fight today than 10 years ago. Japan has been at war in Manchuria, and France in Morocco. The rumbles from Germany are far from reassuring. There is more talk of war, and more money is spent getting ready for it than before war was outlawed. The mention of the odious outlawed act called "war" is avoided quite simply by omitting a formal declaration before the shooting begins. It saves the pacifist face and stimulates the belief that the soldiers are playing "ring around the rosie", if the real name of the game is not announced.

The nine-power past was to bring new and sweeter pacifism to the Pacific Ocean. Negotiation between the signers was to settle any dispute over far eastern questions. Any signatory has the right to call a conference. But for the last 3 years a major conflict between two signers, involving important interests of two others has gone on, but no signer yet has sent out invitations for a formal talk.

The value of European nonaggression pacts is open to question so long as they do not include all interested parties in a given region. They are generally multilateral, and provide that no party shall invade the other's territory nor join with any third nation who might do so. Germany and Poland have signed a nonaggression agreement which—so long as Germany covets the Ukraine—virtually cancels the Russo-Polish one. So long as Germany is out of the eastern European pacts and Bulgaria and Hungary are out of the Balkan pacts, the general effect of the agreements is simply to array superior force against those nations. Nonagression pacts as a practical matter may actually prevent solution of national economic and political differences and tempt outsiders to use force as the only way of escaping restraints.

International disarmament negotiations have been under way for more than 8 years. This worthy endeavor started with the preparatory commission in 1926 and reached its climax in the General Disarmament Conference of 1932. For the last 2 years it has been in practically continuous session through its general commission or subsidiary committees. Its principal value has been in disclosing the following principles: No nation will disarm that feels itself insecure. None will give up essential elements of its national defense for any compensation, the value of which has not been established by experience. All nations are reluctant to surrender sovereign rights to any international league. General disarmament agreements between nations are impractical; regional agreements are more promising.

To date no agreements have been reached, no convention signed; and the disarmament talks appear to have widened the breach between France and Germany. Ending the conference without agreement would lessen the League's prestige and mean the resumption by Germany of its liberty of action on armaments. To keep the conference going without Germany shows how impractical are the methods by which it is striving for its ideals.

Repeated knocks from hard experience have put deep crimps into the fond belief of the first decade after the war—that the problem of international peace could be settled by frank conversations between foreign secretaries running all over the world visiting one another. The general disarmament conference did not blow away war clouds. The London Economic Conference did not end the depression. The Montevideo Conference was considered successful because no blows were exchanged openly. Conferences appear to be going out of style.

Post-war liberalism has given way to a general feeling that little is to be hoped from international cooperation. Are hard-headed statesmen swinging again to the idea that treaties and pacts are scraps of paper which may only feed the flames when a match is applied? International yearnings are being replaced by a policy of strictest nationalism with force to back it. The visible growth of armaments is proof enough. I grant the fact that each nation must be prepared to look out for itself, in its turn, engenders a further feeling of insecurity and tends to discourage peace. But I am talking of things as they are, not as we would like to see them. Throughout the world there is a typical pre-war psychosis, easily distinguished from the post-war relaxation and desire for reconstruction.

In a situation so full of possibilities for an outbreak of violence that ultimately might involve us it is not safe for the United States to be so afraid of preparedness that no other large nation will be afraid of her. It is high time to face facts on how we would stand if we were dragged into war.

Here are some facts: The United States has fewer soldiers in its active Army and air force per mile of frontier than any other power. Its 13 for each mile compares with 47 for Russia and Germany, for example, and 210 for France. We have far fewer active and reserve soldiers in our Army and Air Corps for every thousand square miles of our territory than any other large country. Our 116 for every thousand square miles makes a poor showing, indeed, against the 13,995 in Germany, 14,958 in Japan, 32,019 in France, and 54,034 in Italy. The figures in both cases are for the mother country only, exclusive of colonial possessions.

The same discouraging disparity is shown in the number of active and reserve soldiers for each 1,000 of population. The 5.2 average of the United States sets the low for all great powers, the averages for other countries ranging rapidly upward to totals of 154 for Italy and 162.4 for France.

The national defense expenditures of other nations in proporportion of their expenditures for 1933, including only appropriations made for and spent in that year, the United States is behind all but Germany and Russia. Our preparations for defense that year represented 13.4 percent of our total expenditures; those of France, 29.42 percent; Italy's, 30.21 percent; and Japan's, 36.9 percent.

A downward trend is shown in our national defense expenditures since 1930, while those of other powers, except the British commonwealth of nations, have shown a sharp upward climb. When I speak of Germany's outlay in this connection I refer only to that which appears on the war department budget. A great deal of apprehension has been felt in Europe as to military preparations in Germany not shown in open accounts.

Summing up our position, we are second at sea, fourth in the air, and last in land armed forces of all the great nations of the world.

That summary is alarming to all who are familiar with our military requirements in the event of war and who realize the present precarious state of peace. In view of our geographic situation and our national feeling against anything even remotely resembling militarism, let us consider only the irreducible minimum for safety.

The rock-bottom safety factor is to have a strong enough army and navy to hold off an invader until we can mobilize our people and our resources in case of attack. In a future war we might not have allies keeping the enemy in check until we train civilians in hastily assembled camps and transform our peace-time factories into munitions works. The now historic "hands across the sea" may be extended with rifles in them.

Our immediate needs for defense are to guarantee our mobilization against interference from any source by any means; to provide for a rapid and efficient mobilization of the Nation's man power, industry, and resources; and to guarantee the security of our critical overseas areas. Those are factors which enable a peaceful nation to hold off attack. An ultimate safety factor would be the preparation, behind this first shock protection, for the subsequent employment of the offensive in overwhelming strength. In the long run we could not safely rest with the mere repulse of attackers pounding at our gates.

The defense of our coast and overseas possessions requires sea power enough in both the Atlantic and the Pacific to cover critical

areas against the primary onslaught, and to hold off the enemy until naval reinforcements sufficient to establish superiority of strength can arrive from the ocean where no immediate danger threatens. I am deliberately avoiding an emphasis on the possibility that we might be attacked on both the Atlantic and the Pacific at the same time, so that none may say that I am exaggerating reasonable hazards.

Under favorable conditions the major elements of the fleet could be assembled and transferred from ocean to ocean through the Panama Canal in 20 days. That is less time than it would take to form and dispatch an important convoy against us from either Asiatic or European ports. We cannot hope to equal the strength of all possible naval combinations, but our national-defense interests do demand a navy equal to that of our strongest possible single opponent. We haven't that today, although we seem to be moving toward it.

Beginning in 1922, when we voluntarily gave up more naval tonnage than any other nation in order to reach an agreement on naval ratios, we followed for 11 years the policy of encouraging disarmament by example. To indicate our strong desire for curtailment we went to the length of not replacing over-age and obsolete ships. We fell far behind the two other great naval powers, Great Britain and Japan. We have faithfully observed our obligation to maintain the military status quo in our possessions west of Hawaii. We are mandatory for no territory in that region.

Even idealistic America decided she was playing a lone hand by 1933 and that her policy was seriously weakening her safety and prestige. Her awakening was followed by the authorization and appropriation for some 37 vessels of various types, leaving us 102 vessels of all types short of our authorized treaty strength. Although we still will be considerably below Great Britain and only about equal to Japan in 1936, the Vinson building law gives the Navy, for the first time in our history, a business-like replacement program for ships, and a logical and orderly plan for the procurement of naval aircraft and personnel.

This law looks forward to the gradual building of the Navy to full treaty strength of under-age ships. We hope that will never be necessary—that in future international conferences agreements will be reached under which other nations will reduce their naval tonnages to our level in existing ratios. All we would need to do then would be to balance our naval force and replace ships as they become over-age. If other nations insist on holding their navies at present full treaty strength, and in view of Imperial Japan's denunciation of the naval treaty, national safety demands our following the Vinson building plan to completion. In the meantime it gives us something to bargain with in future conferences looking toward armament reduction. Our reductions can take the form of curtailing the program, rather than scrapping good ships.

We need more than a Navy and its complementary air equipment, however, to provide an adequate covering force for protection of our national mobilization. The Regular Army and the National Guard also are essential.

While the lessons of the World War were fresh in our minds the National Defense Act of June 4, 1920, authorized a peace strength Regular Army of 17,728 officers and 280,000 enlisted men. General Staff studies, in attempts to carry out the requirements with every possible reduction in cost, have arrived at an absolute minimum slightly lower—14,063 officers and 165,000 enlisted men. But Congress has gone below that absolute minimum. By successive cuts in appropriations it has reduced the Regular Army to an average approximate strength of only 12,000 officers, 118,750 enlisted men, and 6,500 Philippine Scouts, which last we shall lose probably this year.

When it is considered that the Regular Army is not only the guard against surprise attack but also the nucleus around which a citizen army would have to be built in time of emergency, the gravity of present conditions becomes more apparent. Four peace strength infantry divisions (one for each of the four army commands), three peace-strength cavalry divisions, a mechanized cavalry brigade, and a general headquarters air force, with some auxiliary units is the least that safety demands as an initial covering force.

Without neglecting its other equally important missions, the present Regular Army could not provide that force. General MacArthur, Chief of Staff, made that clear in his testimony in June 1934 on the Thompson bill hearings when he said:

"Three major missions we cannot now perform. I must choose which of these missions I will attempt, well knowing the failure of one may result in failure in all. We must keep our outposts; we must stop the invader, and we must mobilize. Today I would be unable to do so. Any two I might accomplish, but all three, impossible."

In a sudden major emergency, after decision has been made to use troops in addition to those of the Regular Army, we have to depend first upon the National Guard. Here, again, the United States is lacking. The National Defense Act provided a total National Guard of 435,800 officers and enlisted men by 1924. Each succeeding Congress has failed to appropriate necessary funds. The War Department attempted to get enough for a guard of 250,000, and the Chief of the Militia Bureau tried for one of 210,000. Both attempts failed. Since 1930 appropriations have limited the guard to 190,211.

The Officers' Reserve Corps could supplement our commissioned personnel, but there is no reserve from which trained enlisted men could be quickly drawn. There are approximately 6,000 men in our enlisted Reserve Corps—a mere handful. The shortage of Regular Army reserves is a great deficiency in our defense. The National Guard might have more time to fill up gaps with local volunteers, but its efficiency would be directly affected by the number of untrained men it had to use.

An Officers' Reserve Corps of 120,000 active Reserve officers is essential to meet the needs of emergency mobilization. Last reports showed a total of about 113,000. By all means we should keep up our work of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps and our citizens' military training camps to augment the number of men with some groundwork of military schooling who can and will step forward if a call to arms should sound.

The tremendous size which adds to the greatness of our country adds also to the difficulty of protecting it. We have sea and land frontiers of more than 8,000 miles, second only to those of Russia among the world powers. For guarding them—with fewer soldiers per mile than any other great nation, remember—it is impractical to hold the bulk of our Army in a central position. It would be too far from the possible danger points. We must maintain four zones, each necessarily organized, garrisoned, and supplied as a possible independent theater of operations.

The problem is further complicated by the Panama Canal, our overseas possessions, and aviation. The Canal is a vital point for the whole maritime world. Not only must it be defended, but we must be able to keep open the lines of communication to and from it. To make that certain, our possessions in the West Indies, as bases near the entrance to the Caribbean, must be guarded from any act of war.

Hawaii must have a covering force capable of sustained and separate action. On it—in this day of aircraft, especially—depends the security of our west coast and west-coast trade. And while we retain a holding in the Far East, Hawaii is an advanced base essential for the protection of our far eastern possessions. We cannot be too strong in Hawaii.

The importance of Alaska is growing constantly, and its defense problems—air, land, and naval—must be calculated independently of our continental needs. It has a maximum resident strength of only 4,000 white men qualified for military service. The economic resources of Alaska and Kurile Islands regions are gazed upon covetously by others. Polar flying and improved navigation aids have reduced the protection climate once afforded. The time may come unexpectedly when keeping a few hundred men in Alaska to protect her from foreign invasion will not be enough.

The strategic value of the Philippines depends on our far eastern policy. So long as that policy insists on equal trade opportunities with China, with freedom of transit for our goods and purchases to and from Asiatic ports, a base in the western Pacific is demanded. The present choice of our statesmen seems to be to surrender this advantage, but the ultimate decision will not be made for 10 years. In the meantime, it is our obligation to protect and police these islands and our sea trade routes. We could not do it in a war with the defensive means now available. From a military standpoint the Philippines, now indefensible because of the treaty of 1922, are neither an asset nor a liability. In the event of a foreign war those islands would be at the disposition of the victor, no matter who occupied them in the meantime.

Aviation enables us to strike swiftly at an enemy, but it makes it possible for an enemy to strike at us with equal speed. It cuts down our geographic isolation. Only at our peril can we fail to take it into account. Aviation has its balanced place. It may start the next war. Conservative and well-informed opinion is that aviation alone can never win a major war.

A move is under way now to correct the present deplorable condition of our Army Air Corps. A program calling for a total of 2,320 planes—almost double what the Army now has—offers a patriotic opportunity to the present Congress. It is to be hoped that Congress will grant the increase.

I have indicated some of the more obvious gaps in our permanent defense structure that would invite an active enemy. One might think that with so little of a permanent nature on which to rely, we would be ready at an instant's notice to draw upon our much-boasted resources. But not yet! Despite the fact that history shows we cannot depend on volunteers, despite the essential urgency of speed in the unhappy event of war, we have not yet on our statute books an authorization for the Commander in Chief, the President, to call men to the colors, by selective service. We must still depend on our legislators to pass the laws after the threat arises—while precious days are wasted. In April 1917 Congress provided no adequate funds for more than a month after it declared war.

As with men, so with material. Industrial organization, so vital in modern war, must keep step with the mobilization of men. The War Department and our industries now cooperate in peacetime planning so far as possible. But that is not nearly so far as is found possible in other strong nations. "Ultimately", many say in serene self-confidence, "we could turn out materials and supplies faster than other countries." Ultimately is a long, long road in a crisis. Other countries are better equipped to meet war demands at the outset. After 19 months in the World War, no American-built airplane was on the front when the armistice was signed on November 11, 1918. Only a few shots were fired from American-built artillery. What might happen before we really got started? A law enabling the President to mobilize industry without delay is as necessary as a law permitting him to mobilize men. If possible, the profit motive should not be allowed to enter. The reiteration of this axiomatic fact wins the front page for some statesman nearly every week. When men are offering their lives, industry should be ready to give its services without gain.

Our advance arrangements for assembling materials for war are inadequate enough, but the current munitions investigation may cause misinterpretations which will cripple them. The amount of munitions sold abroad by American firms is trivial. There is in this country not a single manufacturing concern exclusively engaged in ordnance production nor in any other such property described as munitions except to an insignificant extent.

A perspective is hard to maintain amid wild claims and counter claims. We have even heard the argument that collusion by munitions men was indicated in the World War, because the French and Germans did not fire on coal and iron fields. A little thought will throw light on that. Naturally each side desired to save such fields, believing it had a chance to take them for its own use, an accomplishment that would have ended the war in a hurry. The strategy of General Pershing's plan for the final drive in 1918 was to cut the Germans off from those precious stores of coal and iron. The French were influenced, of course, not only by the great war value of the territory but also by the reluctance to bombard Alsace Lorraine, where the population was largely French, and to recover which was never absent from French hearts.

Other powers maintain large enough subsidized and government-owned munition plants to meet their needs. The United States, in time of war, depends almost entirely on private manufacture. Curtailment of this manufacture by denying its outlets would work to our disadvantage and to the advantage of possible enemies. Prohibiting the exportation of arms, munitions, or implements of war favors the powerful aggressor, who prepares for a short war of conquest by accumulating supplies. It handicaps the nations who do not make elaborate plans.

In all our major wars in the past we have had to obtain munitions from foreign shores. In the Revolutionary War they came from France and Holland; in the Civil War from France, Great Britain, Belgium, and Austria; in the Spanish-American War from Great Britain; in the World War from France and Great Britain.

The question of exclusive Government manufacture of arms in our country was thoroughly examined and completely rejected when war was imminent 18 years ago. An exhaustive study of nationalization was made, and in the matter of comparative costs found that the Government, with no selling expense, no taxes, no insurance, except to pay fire and accident losses at actual cost, and borrowing money as only the Government can borrow, beat the purchase price on articles made by private enterprise by about 11 percent. The Government now operates six manufacturing arsenals in a small way. These at full capacity could produce less than 5 percent of our requirements for a major war. This nationalized industry to handle the major war load would have to be immediately expanded to 19 times its present capacity. A conservative estimate of the value of those six arsenals is $163,000,000. One hundred percent capacity for war-time need would mean first cost of $3,097,000,000 for plant. Capitalize it at 3 percent and you have an annual carrying charge of $92,910,000 on plant and equipment. That takes no account of amortization or obsolescence or a pay roll of several million dollars per year. This vast establishment during a long interval of peace would, I venture to believe, never be operated. Witness several similar idle "elephants" surviving from war days—for example, the $65,000,000 nitrate plant at Muscle Shoals idle for 15 years. If you nationalize rifles, why stop short of nationalizing the machinery, the raw materials, the powder, and for the powder the cotton, nitric acid, and alcohol?

We cannot escape quarrels and conflicts by minding our own business. Our business is too extensive and far-reaching. It interferes with the business of too many other nations. We have invaded all markets and penetrated all continents. The more we expand our industrial establishments and agricultural plant, the more we shall require those outlets, which Europe and Asia must also secure as they further enlarge productivity through efficient practices and surplus-creating equipment.

We may point to the past in evidence that we have never waged a war of conquest. But the fact remains that our occupancy of markets once dominated by other powers constitute economic invasion and curtails their opportunity to sell goods, increase employment, improve living standards, and provide income for their several populations.

From the days of Rome the wars of trade and the trade of war have proceeded side by side. We are too rich, we are too powerful in commerce and industry to confide our destiny to bare hands and the protection of mere treaties. International faith perished on the borders of Belgium, and international honor as represented by war debts is buried in the vaults of the United States Treasury. As the greatest creditor nation in history, we have suddenly become the most unpopular. Our wealth, our shrewdness, and our competitive strength thwart universal plans and ambitions. We cannot keep our flag at home when we send our goods and our salesmen abroad. And if we are not prepared to defend our trade and our citizens, they must ultimately yield right-of-way and outlets to those powers whose present position and future growth depend upon the export of goods they cannot domestically absorb.

We cannot determine by a pacifist policy whether or not we shall have another war. Our commercial policy may at any moment involve us in complications that demand ultimatums and an iron hand. If the time ever comes when we are unable to enforce our just rights, American industry will be prostrated by discriminatory treaties, further defaulted obligations, and exclusion from irreplaceable markets.

It is a dangerous thing to be rich and defenseless. Therefore, our country, whatever its inclination, must maintain a military and naval strength imposing enough to discourage affront and aggression—sufficient to protect the liberties and property of its subjects, and modern enough to cope with any emergency or armament that challenges our safety.

The better we are prepared for war the less we are likely to face it. Experience does not confirm the dictum that "right is might", without an enforcing agency. The Incas and the Montezumas and the Ming emperors stand in spirit beside me tonight to testify how perilous it is to create vast empires and confide their safety to Providence. And the incredible rise of the Japanese people from a recently insignificant and impotent estate to a challenging position in world affairs—an achievement consummated within the short span of my own lifetime—warns us that no generation can ever anticipate with what new and suddenly potent forces the next must cope.

If we desire to prosper in peace, then we must be stronger than those who plan to profit by war. Our defenses, by land and sea, must be so impressive that no power will be encouraged to provoke our enmity. I know of no insurance policy that may be purchased as cheaply. Those who protest at the consequent burden upon national income will be well advised to consider the alternative cost of impotence against an effective enemy. And those who shrink at the thought of bearing arms for the defense of the Nation would be wise to contemplate the compulsory service which a successful enemy would extract from our youth if this should ever become a conquered province.

We dare not disarm at a moment when racial hatreds and megalomanias, world over, are trooping to the colors—while enlarged fleets, armies, and air squadrons everywhere inform us that ancient grudges are feeding fat again through Europe and Asia—and the tramp of training millions shakes the world. The battlefields on which we thought the last great war had been fought were sowed with dragon's teeth, and the Almighty alone knows when and what the harvest will be.

Earnest, sincere men and women by the thousands feel sure that we would be on better terms with the rest of the world if we demonstrated pacific intentions by abolishing even our present inadequate Military Establishment—in brief, that being unable to defend ourselves will protect us from violence. But helplessness did not save Belgium any more than it saved Peru and Mexico from the Spaniards or China from the Manchus.

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Mr. KRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Un-American Activities have until February 15 within which to file its report.

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

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, will that mean any additional expenditure on the part of the Government?

Mr. KRAMER. No; none whatever in addition to those which have already been appropriated. I may say to the gentleman that the members of the committee on the minority side are in accord with this request.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. It is simply to file the report of the committee?

Mr. KRAMER. That is all. There are certain necessary elements that have been asked for by some members of the committee, and we will not be able to obtain that for 2 or 3 days. For that reason, and for other reasons discussed in the report, it is necessary to ask for this additional time.

Mr. BLANTON. There will be no additional employees employed under this former appropriation?

Mr. KRAMER. None except the stenographers necessary to make the report.

Mr. BLANTON. And only the present stenographers are continued on?

Mr. KRAMER. That is all.

Mr. BLANTON. And only to make the report?

Mr. KRAMER. That is all.

Mr. BLANTON. And for no other purpose?

Mr. KRAMER. For no other purpose.

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

There was no objection.

REPUBLICAN INDUSTRY

Mr. AMLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the subject of unemployment relief.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. AMLIE. Mr. Speaker, the objection to this measure comes from the spokesmen of the Republican Party. They state that they object to the measure only because of its broad delegation of power to the executive branch of the

Government. They hasten to add that they are not against relief, that they are not against public works, and that their principal objection to the bill is due to the fact that it does not specify the various projects for which the appropriation in question is to be used.

In my opinion, the people of the country are not going to be greatly impressed by the objection of the spokesmen of the Republican Party. They are not going to be impressed, because they have not forgotten the history of the Republican Party and the record of these same spokesmen during the past 5 years of the depression.

During the first session of the Seventy-second Congress we had before the House of Representatives the so-called "Garner public-works bill". This bill provided for an appropriation of approximately one and a half billion dollars for public works. Mr. Speaker Garner had gone to the various Government departments and inquired of them what work projects they had under contemplation for the near future. He took these various items and included them in one bill. His bill merely telescoped into a period of 1 year projects which under the normal course of events would probably have been put through during the ensuing 3 years. Each and every project with the amount involved was set forth in the Garner bill. This bill, therefore, was not subject to the objection that these same Republican spokesmen have made against the present measure. Nor was there any lack of demand for relief in 1932. According to the October 1934 issue of the magazine Fortune, there were 11,500,000 unemployed wage earners in the United States during 1932. When the Garner bill came up for consideration in the House, it was branded as a piece of "pork barrel" legislation by the spokesmen of the Republican Party. It was denounced as a piece of "pork barrel" legislation by virtually every Republican newspaper in the country.

Mr. SNELL, who was floor leader of the Republican Party in the House of Representatives, said—June 7, 1932, page 12227:

> Title I provides for $100,000,000 to be placed in the hands of the President to be distributed as a gratuity to anyone needing it and asking for it. That is going further than the Federal Government has ever gone in any matter of relief, so far as I know, in the history of the country. The reason I am opposed to that primarily is that the minute you start that you are never going to stop it. In my judgment, the $100,000,000 will probably be used before next fall, and by the time we get back here we will be asked to put up two or three or four hundred million more, and you will have a heavier tax burden than ever placed on our people.
>
> Furthermore, the minute you hang up the advertisement that we have a hundred-million-dollar fund which any man can get who says he is in need, you absolutely stop all sources of private contributions to charity. That has been the experience, even in local communities.

So, with 11,500,000 unemployed in the United States, the spokesman of the Republican Party felt that it was a problem to be handled through private contributions to charity. He objected to the appropriation of $100,000,000 because the then Republican President would probably spend it all by the ensuing December, at which time he was fearful that the Congress might be called upon to appropriate three or four hundred million more to care for the unemployed. What a perfectly terrible thought this was; and the method that the spokesman for the Republican Party proposed to follow to avoid this situation was simply not to start appropriating anything to care for the unemployed. At least it must be said for the spokesmen of the Republican Party in 1932 that their plan was perfectly simple and readily understandable. This, after all, was a rather curious position for the spokesmen of the Republican Party to have taken in 1932, particularly since President Hoover was elected in 1928 standing squarely on the proposition of a large public-works program in case of an economic depression.

I have recounted this brief congressional history of June 7, 1932, because the leaders of the Republican Party in my State saw to it during the next few months that I was not given any opportunity to forget. As a Member of the House of Representatives elected on the Republican ticket I voted for the Garner bill (p. 12243–12244, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 1st sess. 72d Cong.).

Immediately the leaders of the Republican Party and the Republican press from one end of the country to the other set up a great hue and cry about "pork barrel" legislation. In the State of Wisconsin the regular Republicans based their campaign primarily upon their opposition to public works, particularly their opposition to the La Follette grade-elimination program.

I confess I am not greatly impressed by the sincerity of the leaders of the Republican Party when they state that they object to House Joint Resolution 117 on the ground that the funds involved are not appropriated for specific projects and purposes.

I am also sure that the people of the country will not be impressed by the argument of the Republican spokesmen—particularly the unemployed people. When I was last a Member of this House the Republicans made up almost one-half of the total Membership of the House. They are now less than one-fourth, and I venture the prediction that the Republican Party will never again have as great a Membership in this House as they have at the present time.

ADMINISTRATION BILL INADEQUATE

It is difficult to state how many people are unemployed at the present time. Estimates are available from various sources. These estimates place the number of unemployed from eleven to fourteen million.

Since this depression began the most accurate figures on industrial unemployment have been furnished by the American Federation of Labor. On last October 7 the American Federation of Labor released the following estimates based on the first 3 months of 1934:

Persons employable (United States census figures)	48,829,920
Wholly unemployed or on temporary part time	16,846,322
Totally unemployed	9,326,514
On temporary and part-time jobs, including Government-financed projects	7,519,808

While the A. F. of L. estimates may be reasonably adequate, so far as industrial unemployment is concerned, these same figures do not take into adequate consideration the extent of other types of unemployment, including the large measure of unemployment now prevalent in rural sections. That is to say, the large number of farm boys and girls who stay at home on the farm, although they are in no sense needed to carry on the operations of the farm.

A year ago there were 11,000,000 people in the United States who applied for C. W. A. work. It would be safe to say that there are at least one-half million more unemployed today who were employed a year ago, and probably a million more, due to the natural maturing of young people.

It would perhaps be safe to say that there are in the United States today approximately 12,000,000 employable unemployed. Of this number approximately 1,000,000 single people and about 5,000,000 heads of families are on relief. There are approximately 20,000,000 people today who are dependent upon Federal relief for a living.

When we take into consideration this situation, it begins to be apparent how wholly inadequate the administration program is. When the President talks about putting the unemployed to work and liquidating the F. E. R. A. by July 1, one cannot help wondering whether the President, though a humane man, has any clear conception of the present unemployment situation.

In his message to the House the President talked about one and one-half million people on the Federal relief roles who are unemployables. Under present requirements for employment this figure is undoubtedly low. Although under circumstances such as existed during the World War, this estimate would no doubt be high.

It would still be safe to say that there are 12,000,000 unemployed people who are employable.

The administration expects to put three and one-half million people to work on public-works projects at $50 per month. This figure seems to be tacitly accepted by the administration spokesmen in the House, and for that reason I am using it. The administration also expects that the employment of three and one-half million people on public-works projects would give employment to an equal number

of people in industry fabricating and transporting the material to be used on the public-works projects.

This assumption is no doubt made because it has been commonly supposed that for each job directly provided on public-works jobs another job would be provided in industry manufacturing and transporting the materials.

At the public-works hearings held here 3 years ago it was commonly estimated that 80 percent of the money spent on public-works projects would go to labor either directly or indirectly. It seems to me, however, that this is a sanguine figure. If we accept it, however, it means that approximately 7,000,000 people would be given work either directly or indirectly at slightly less than $50 per month.

If it is expected that three and one-half million people, who are to be given work in industry fabricating and transporting the materials to be used on public-works projects, are to be paid an average of $50 per month, it is easy to see what is going to become of the American tradition of high wages.

The person is naive indeed who believes we can have 7,000,000 people working for $50 per month without having the general wage level reduced to approximately the same standard.

This general program raises a great many interesting questions. If we are to adopt the general idea of work battalions in the United States, can we also proceed to establish and maintain codes for the purpose of maintaining prices? If prices are not to be maintained, then what policy are we to follow regarding the general debt structure of the country? These are only a few of the questions that legislators ought to ask themselves.

And it should be noted further that the administration plan contemplates making provisions directly and indirectly for only 7,000,000 people on this bare subsistence basis. It leaves out of calculation altogether approximately 5,000,000 unemployed people. The administration's plan tacitly assumes that these 5,000,000 people can go on indefinitely living on past savings. Unfortunately, there is an end to the ability of the unemployed to live on their savings or the wages and contributions of their friends and relatives. This has been very notably demonstrated in my own State of Wisconsin where the percentage of people on relief during the past few months has gone up from 12 to 20 percent of the total population of the State. From the foregoing it will be seen that the administration's plan—if correctly disclosed in the President's message to Congress—is less than 50 percent adequate as an unemployment measure.

TEN MILLION DOLLARS NEEDED FOR ADEQUATE PUBLIC-WORKS PROGRAM

If the unemployed are to be given work directly and indirectly through public-works projects, we must expect to spend a minimum of $10,000,000,000 for the current year.

If this were to be proposed, however, the reactionaries of the country, Republican as well as Democratic, would immediately raise the hue and cry that this would result in wild inflation. This, however, does not follow. During the period of the World War we spent a sum in excess of $10,000,000,000 a year during the entire 4 years of the war. We are today faced with a situation far more critical than the one which existed at that time.

I am not greatly impressed with the sincerity of the business groups that raise the cry of inflation. In most instances these groups are not opposed to inflation providing they are the beneficiaries of the particular inflationary measure contemplated. The international bankers did not hesitate to unload approximately $12,000,000,000 of foreign securities on the investors of the United States following the termination of the World War. These securities are today largely worthless. To the extent to which American manufacturers were able to find foreign markets, by sacrificing the savings of American investors, we had an inflation during the period of the twenties. The bankers were willing to join in this raid by American business on American investors because of the commissions they received.

At the present time the Government is spending approximately $180,000,000 a month for relief. The American retail business men and the American manufacturers do not object particularly to these Government expenditures so long as this money is spent with the American retailers for privately manufactured goods. In short, when any expenditure of money by the Federal Government is proposed it is objected to on the ground that it is inflationary only by the particular business group that does not share in the business thus created.

If American business men and the Members of this House were really sincere in their efforts to provide for the unemployed, it could be done with the amount of money provided for in this joint resolution.

FIVE BILLION ADEQUATE IF UNEMPLOYED ARE PERMITTED TO CONTRIBUTE OWN LABOR

This $5,000,000,000 a year would be adequate for relief if the unemployed were permitted to contribute their own labor toward their own support.

At the present time it has been estimated that we are spending approximately $180,000,000 a month for relief. Approximately 75 percent of this amount goes for direct relief, while 25 percent goes for made-work projects.

If we were to dispense with the made-work projects and simply try to take care of the unemployed by relief methods, it is estimated that this could be done for $145,000,000 a month.

This plan would, of course, completely ignore the welfare of the people on relief. It would subject all of the unemployed to the demoralization which results from enforced idleness. It is the plan supported by American business as evidenced by the recent conference held at White Sulphur Springs, W. Va. At this conference American business came out definitely for the dole as a solution for the problems of the unemployed in the United States. This is the program of the reactionaries in both the Democratic and Republican Parties.

If we were determined to provide for the same kind of care for the unemployed but were willing to sacrifice the retailers, we could take care of the people who are now on relief on present relief standards by means of mass purchases and distribution at a cost of approximately $115,000,000 a month. But, as stated, this would leave the retail business man and the jobber completely out of the picture. It would be politically unwise for any group to sacrifice the business man who performs the functions of distribution in our economic system.

These business men are in close touch with the average American voter. They deal with the voting public constantly. The American retail business man is not against Government expenditure on the ground that it might result in inflation, providing these expenditures go through the regular retail channels. I am not advocating this method. I am merely calling attention to the fact that present relief standards could be maintained at a saving of approximately $30,000,000 a month, providing we were willing to leave the American retail business man out of the picture.

But there is another way in which the unemployed could be maintained on present relief standards at a substantial saving. This could be accomplished if we were to permit the unemployed to contribute their own labor and services toward their own support and maintenance through a national self-help movement. It has been ascertained that the people who are now unemployed could be taken care of at present relief levels for approximately $75,000,000 a month.

But, of course, such a plan would deprive both the American manufacturer and the American retail business man of what they feel to be their share of Government expenditures. From the foregoing it is perfectly clear that the American business man is opposed to Government spending on the ground that it is inflationary only so long as he does not get a lion's share of the money spent.

When it has been proposed to permit the unemployed to contribute their labor toward their own support it has been immediately branded as socialism. I have heard many Members in the House speak with righteous indignation of the fact that the F. E. R. A. has made approximately 2,000,000 mattresses for the use of the unemployed. This, in the opinion of many Members of this House, is a terrible offense.

They are not concerned with the fact that a year ago we had approximately 2,000,000 families in the United States who had no mattresses of any kind on which to sleep. These people ought to realize that these unemployed do not have the means with which to buy mattresses in the usual course of trade and that relief allowances are not sufficient to provide for items of this kind. The same thing could be said of other necessities that have been manufactured during the past year by various State units operating in conjunction with the F. E. R. A. If we are willing to do justice by the 12,000,000 employable unemployed, we should give them the opportunity to contribute their own labor toward their own support. The $4,800,000,000 provided for in this bill would be adequate to give the unemployed of this country a decent standard of living if it were to be used in this manner, provided, of course, that the operation of such a plan were not sabotaged by the vested interests. Three years ago the Republican Party took the stand that the unemployed were in the plight they were in because of their own failures and shortcomings. In the past 3 years there has been a complete change in public opinion on this subject. The public opinion of the United States today recognizes that the plight of the 12,000,000 unemployed is due to no fault of their own. This same public opinion recognizes that it is the duty of the Federal Government to make adequate provisions for the well-being of these people.

What is more, public opinion is beginning to recognize that we are entering an era where abundance is possible for every citizen of the country. As time goes on this sentiment is bound to find increasing favor.

We are now called upon to consider a measure which the President of the United States says is adequate to discharge our duty to the unemployed people of this country. But if the money appropriated is to be spent for public works in the manner indicated by the President's message, then even the most casual analysis shows that the amount provided in the proposed plan offers no promise of abundance in the future, nor is the amount provided more than half enough to meet the obligation which an awakened public opinion requires of us here and now. If for every dollar that we appropriate in this measure for the unemployed 50 cents is to go to satisfy the demands of American business, then it becomes our duty to appropriate $2 where $1 might otherwise be sufficient. We should either increase the amount of this appropriation to $10,000,000,000 or else we should provide that this sum is to be used for the lease or purchase of idle factories, natural resources, and raw materials, and thus permit the unemployed to contribute their own labor toward their own support through the manufacture and distribution of those things required by a decent American standard of living.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. GRAY of Indiana, for 1 week, on account of important business.

To Mr. VINSON of Georgia, for 5 days, on account of important business.

To Mr. DIRKSEN, for 7 days, on account of business.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 92. An act to prohibit the making of photographs, sketches, or maps of vital military and naval defensive installations and equipment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 403. An act to amend the act of Congress approved March 1, 1899, entitled "An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to remove dangerous and unsafe buildings and parts thereof, and for other purposes", and to further amend said act by adding at the end thereof new sections nos. 5 and 6; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 406. An act to amend an act approved May 1, 1906, entitled "An act to create a board for the condemnation of insanitary buildings in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 411. An act to authorize an annual appropriation of $10,000 to pay the pro rata share of the United States of the expenses of the Pan American Institute of Geography and History at Mexico City; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

S. 462. An act to authorize an extension of exchange authority and addition of public lands to the Willamette National Forest in the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 464. An act to add certain lands to the Malheur National Forest in the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 575. An act to amend the Mining Act of May 10, 1872, as amended; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

S. 619. An act to amend section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920; to the Committee on Merchant Marine, Radio, and Fisheries.

S. 736. An act for the relief of Louise Fox; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

S. 753. An act to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of the Wales Island Packing Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1068. An act to establish a commission for the settlement of the special claims comprehended within the terms of the convention between the United States of America and the United Mexican States concluded April 24, 1934; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

S. 1226. An act to prohibit the sending of unsolicited merchandise through the mails; to the Committee on Post Office and Post Roads.

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 and 4 minutes p. m.) the House, pursuant to its order previously entered, adjourned until Monday, February 4, 1935, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

184. A letter from the president of the Georgetown Gas Light Co., transmitting a detailed statement of the business of the Georgetown Gaslight Co., together with a list of stockholders, for the year ended December 31, 1934; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

185. A letter from the president of the Washington Gas Light Co., transmitting a detailed statement of the business of the Washington Gas Light Co., together with a list of stockholders, for the year ended December 31, 1934; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

186. A letter from the president of the Capital Transit Co., transmitting report covering the operations of the Capital Transit Co. for the calendar year 1934, with balance sheet as of December 31, 1934; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

187. A letter from the president of the Washington Interurban Railroad Co., transmitting report covering the operations of the company for the calendar year 1934; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

188. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, pursuant to section 1 of the Rivers and Harbors Act approved January 21, 1927, and section 10 of the Flood Control Act, approved May 15, 1928, a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated January 28, 1935, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, containing a general plan for the improvement of Kanawha River, W. Va., Va., and N. C., for the purposes of navigation and efficient development of its water power, the control of floods, and the needs of irrigation (H. Doc. No. 91); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

189. A letter from the president of the Potomac Electric Power Co., transmitting a report of the company for the year

ended December 31, 1934; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

190. A letter from the president of the Washington Railway & Electric Co., transmitting a report of the company for the year ended December 31, 1934; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 617 A bill to correct the military record of Lake B. Morrison; without amendment (Rept. No. 40). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. TURNER: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 972. A bill for the relief of John Costigan; without amendment (Rept. No. 50). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 1846. A bill for the relief of Daniel W. Seal; without amendment (Rept. No. 41). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. TURNER: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 2117. A bill for the relief of Cora A. Snyder; without amendment (Rept. No. 42). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HARTER: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 2294. A bill for the relief of Thaddeus C. Knight; without amendment (Rept. No. 43). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MONTET: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 3071. A bill for the relief of Second Lt. Charles E. Upson; without amendment (Rept. No. 44). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. TURNER: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 3266. Authorizing the maintenance and use of a banking house upon the United States military reservation at Fort Lewis, Wash.; without amendment (Rept. No. 45). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MONTET: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 3722. A bill for the relief of Samuel Kaufman; without amendment (Rept. No. 46). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 2128. A bill for the relief of Rossetta Laws; without amendment (Rept. No. 51). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KVALE: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 2678. A bill for the relief of Carl L. Bernau; without amendment (Rept. No. 52). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AYERS: A bill (H. R. 5207) for expenditure of funds for cooperation with the public-school board at Poplar, Mont., in the construction or improvement of public-school building to be available to Indian children of the Fort Peck Indian Reservation, Mont.; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5208) to credit the Fort Belknap Indian tribal funds with certain amounts heretofore expended from tribal funds on irrigation works of the Fort Belknap Reservation, Mont.; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5209) to provide funds for cooperation with the school board at Brockton, Mont., in the extension of the public-school building at that place to be available to Indian children of the Fort Peck Indian Reservation; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5210) to provide funds for cooperation with School District No. 17-H, Big Horn County, Mont., for extension of public-school buildings to be available to Indian children; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5211) to credit the Crow Indian tribal funds with certain amounts heretofore expended from tribal funds on irrigation works of the Crow Reservation, Mont.; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5212) to authorize appropriations for the completion of the public high school at Frazer, Mont.; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5213) to provide funds for cooperation with School District No. 27, Big Horn County, Mont., for extension of public-school buildings to be available to Indian children; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5214) to provide funds for cooperation with the public-school board at Wolf Point, Mont., in the construction or improvement of a public-school building to be available to Indian children of the Fort Peck Indian Reservation; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5215) to provide funds for cooperation with public-school districts in Glacier County, Mont., in the improvement and extension of school buildings to be available to both Indian and white children; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5216) to provide funds for cooperation with Harlem School District No. 12, Blaine County, Mont., for extension of public-school buildings and equipment to be available for Indian children; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BRUNNER: A bill (H. R. 5217) to classify certain positions in the Railway Mail Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5218) to postpone the effective date of certain restrictions respecting air mail contracts; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BUCK: A bill (H. R. 5219) to postpone the effective date of certain restrictions respecting air mail contracts; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. CONNERY: A bill (H. R. 5220) to protect honorably discharged soldiers and sailors of the World War who are in the classified civil service of the United States, and other civil-service employees; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. DEROUEN: A bill (H. R. 5221) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act with respect to rice, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FENERTY: A bill (H. R. 5222) directing the Secretary of State not to enter into any reciprocal trade agreements or understandings with any nation engaging in religious or racial persecution; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KRAMER: A bill (H. R. 5223) to provide disability compensation for the citizens of the United States who have no means of support; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. CONNERY: A bill (H. R. 5224) to provide that the holders of the Medal of Honor, Distinguished Service Cross, or Navy Cross shall be employed in the civil service without examination; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. McSWAIN (by request): A bill (H. R. 5225) to provide relief for disbursing officers of the Army in certain cases; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 5226) to amend the act making appropriations for the military and nonmilitary activities of the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1927, and for other purposes, approved April 15, 1926, so as to equalize the allowances for quarters and subsistence of enlisted men of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 5227) providing for the appointment of an additional justice of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SADOWSKI: A bill (H. R. 5228) to stabilize and standardize money and labor prices by the establishment of a labor-hour monetary system, to guarantee work to all at all times, to give normal prosperity, prevent depressions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOILEAU: A bill (H. R. 5229) directing the Secretary of the Interior to investigate, hear, and determine claims of the individual members of the Stockbridge and

Munsee Tribe of Indians of the State of Wisconsin; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5230) to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear claims of the Stockbridge and Munsee Tribe of Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. HOEPPEL: A bill (H. R. 5231) to amend section 2 of the act of May 25, 1930 (46 Stat. 375); to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. THOMASON: A bill (H. R. 5232) to amend the National Defense Act; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 5233) to authorize the appropriation of $100,000,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to locate and construct through the States of Virginia, North Carolina, Tennessee, Kentucky, and West Virginia, and the District of Columbia, a highway to be known as "Eastern National Park-to-Park Highway"; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. BUCKLER of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 5234) to provide for an annual survey to protect crops from damage by grasshoppers; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5235) to authorize the appropriation of not more than $594,800 for the payment of drainage charges due on the public lands within the counties of Beltrami, Koochiching, and Lake of the Woods, in the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. LLOYD: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 149) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIRKSEN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 150) to prevent rent profiteering in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. FISH: Concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 7) protesting against religious persecution in Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FENERTY: Concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 8) directing the Government of the United States to call upon the Government of Mexico to cease denying fundamental rights to American citizens resident in Mexico, regardless of religious convictions or affiliations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BACON: A bill (H. R. 5236) for the relief of Louis Prince, alias Louis Archibald Trudeau; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BLOOM: A bill (H. R. 5237) for the relief of Amos D. Carver, S. E. Turner, Clifford N. Carver, Scott Blanchard, P. B. Blanchard, James B. Parse, A. N. Blanchard, and W. A. Blanchard, and/or the widows of such of them as may be deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. COLDEN: A bill (H. R. 5238) granting a pension to Melissa P. Seneker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COSTELLO: A bill (H. R. 5239) granting a pension to Mary L. Head; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CRAWFORD: A bill (H. R. 5240) for the relief of Floyd L. Green; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DELANEY: A bill (H. R. 5241) for the relief of Samuel R. Kirschner; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. EDMISTON: A bill (H. R. 5242) to authorize the Secretary of War to convey to the American Legion, Kanawha Valley Post, No. 58, at Montgomery, W. Va., all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain lands in Kanawha County, W. Va.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LLOYD: A bill (H. R. 5243) for the relief of Theophilus Steele; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MOTT: A bill (H. R. 5244) authorizing the Secretary of War to convey to the University of Oregon certain lands forming a part of the Coos Head River and Harbor Reservation; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. QUINN: A bill (H. R. 5245) for the relief of Elizabeth Leiding; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 5246) granting a pension to Frank House; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ROMJUE: A bill (H. R. 5247) granting a pension to Leah Kesterson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5248) granting a pension to Harvey Dodge; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SABATH: A bill (H. R. 5249) for the relief of Martin M. Philipsborn; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SADOWSKI: A bill (H. R. 5250) granting a pension to Belle Hockensmith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5251) for the relief of Azun Khan; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SPENCE: A bill (H. R. 5252) authorizing the President of the United States to appoint Sgt. Samuel Woodfill a captain in the United States Army and then place him on the retired list; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TOLAN: A bill (H. R. 5253) granting a pension to Grace Walcott Fleming; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WHITE: A bill (H. R. 5254) granting a pension to Marion M. Luther; 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:

676. By Mr. ANDREWS of New York: Memorial of the Senate of New York, memorializing Congress to enact such laws to authorize the promulgation of such rules by the Department of Justice or the Interstate Commerce Commission to compel manufacturers of firearms to mark such firearm manufactured with a serial number which will be plainly visible, such serial number to be registered with the Department of Justice as to its consignee at the time of its shipment by the said manufacturer, the consignee to record with the Department of Justice immediately at the time of sale the serial number and to whom such firearm was sold, the Department of Justice thereafter to inform the duly authorized police department of the State involved as to the type of firearm, serial number, name of consignee, and the name of the purchaser; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

677. Also, resolution adopted by the Erie County Board of Supervisors, Buffalo, N. Y., recommending the construction of sewage-disposal system for the entire Niagara frontier, the cost to be borne in its entirety by the Federal Government, the funds to come from the proposed $4,800,000,000 bill for public works and relief projects; to the Committee on Appropriations.

678. Also, resolution adopted by the Order of Benefit Association of Railway Employees of Buffalo, N. Y., supporting enactment of legislation to modify fourth section of Interstate Commerce Act as recommended by the Federal Coordinator of Railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

679. Also, petition of the National Guard Association of New York State, asking Congress to eliminate from that portion of the Army appropriation bill affecting National Guard activities for the fiscal year 1935–36 any provision which in any way might affect the right to Federal pay or Federal recognition of any member of the National Guard of the State of New York; to the Committee on Appropriations.

680. Also, resolution adopted by the Senate of New York State, memorializing the United States Congress to enact legislation to take all profits out of war or put the business of manufacturing munitions of war solely in hands of the United States Government; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

681. Also, petition of the Common Council of the City of Lockport, N. Y., recommending approval of the proposed improvement of the Barge Canal in western New York; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

682. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, memorializing Congress to eliminate the Federal tax on gasoline; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

683. By Mr. BACON: Petition of the St. Lawrence Council, Knights of Columbus, Sayville, Long Island, N. Y., protesting against the policy of oppression and persecution by Mexican Government; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

684. By Mr. BELL: Petition of citizens of Jackson County, Mo., urging adoption of House bill 2856; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

685. By Mr. BOILEAU: Resolution of the Antigo Division, No. 122, Order of Benefit Association of Railway Employees, favoring enactment of legislation as recommended by the Federal Coordinator and covered in House bill 8100 of the Seventy-third Congress; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

686. By Mr. BRUNNER: Resolution of the Arleigh Regular Democratic Club, Inc., 22–45 Thirty-first Street, Astoria, Long Island, N. Y., urging Congress to enact necessary legislation in order that the Home Owners' Loan Corporation can continue to make new loans; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

687. By Mr. BUCKLER of Minnesota: Petition of M. A. Jenson, secretary-treasurer, Roseau, Minn., and members of the Roseau County Farm Holiday Association, urging the immediate passage of the Frazier-Lemke farm-mortgage refinancing bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

688. Also, petition of C. J. Nord and M. M. Jorgenson and other members of the Wolverton Townsend Old Age Revolving Pension Club, all citizens of Wolverton, Minn., praying for support of the Townsend old-age-pension bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

689. By Mr. CONNERY: Petition of the City Council of the City of Lynn, Mass., recording itself as endorsing and favoring the passage of the workers' unemployment and social insurance bill (H. R. 2827); to the Committee on Labor.

690. Also, petition of the grand executive council of the Massachusetts Grand Lodge of the Order of the Sons of Italy in America, favoring old-age-pension legislation; and that such legislation be made applicable to noncitizens as well as citizens, provided that such noncitizens be residents of the United States of America for not less than 10 years prior to the passage of such legislation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

691. By Mr. CRAVENS: Petition of citizens of Pike and Montgomery Counties, Ark., requesting passage of the Townsend old-age-pension plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

692. By Mr. CULLEN: Petition of the Legislature of the State of New York, urging the Federal Government to enact such laws through the Congress or to authorize the promulgation of such rules by the Department of Justice or the Interstate Commerce Commission to compel every manufacturer of firearms to mark such firearm manufactured with a serial number which will be plainly visible, such serial number to be registered with the Department of Justice as to its consignee at the time of its shipment by the said manufacturer, the consignee to record with the Department of Justice immediately at the time of sale the serial number and to whom such firearm was sold; the Department of Justice thereafter to inform the duly authorized police department of the State involved as to the type of firearm; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

693. Also, petition of the Legislature of the State of New York, requesting Congress to enact the Costigan antilynching bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

694. Also, petition of the Senate and Assembly of the State of New York, urging Congress to enact with all convenient speed such legislation as may be necessary to abolish the Federal gasoline sales tax and to surrender to the States exclusively the power to tax such sales in the future; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

695. By Mr. FULMER: Petition of the House of Representatives of South Carolina, James E. Hunter, clerk, favoring legislation introduced by LINDSAY C. WARREN, of North Carolina, making Irish potatoes a basic commodity, believing that such legislation is necessary to protect the welfare of the potato growers of South Carolina, and that such legislation will stabilize production of potatoes and will assist in the orderly marketing of this crop from South Carolina; to the Committee on Agriculture.

696. By Mr. HEALEY: Petition of the Board of Aldermen of the city of Somerville, Mass., protesting against the outrageous conduct of the Government of Mexico toward the freedom of worship, the press, and rights of assembly and education, and calling for the Government of the United States to sever diplomatic relations with the Government of Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

697. By Mr. KIMBALL: Petition of citizens of Third District of Michigan, favoring passage of legislation for the Townsend plan of old-age pensions and a national transaction sales tax calculated to produce revenue to meet requirements of such pensions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

698. By Mr. MARTIN of Colorado: Petition of the General Assembly of Colorado, urging consideration of the Townsend old-age revolving pension plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

699. By Mr. MEAD: Petition of the Senate of the State of New York, requesting the Federal Government to abolish the gasoline sales tax, and to surrender to the States the power to tax such sales in the future; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

700. Also, petition of the Senate of the State of New York, requesting Congress to act with all convenient speed on the enactment of the Costigan-Wagner antilynching bill, or other like legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

701. By Mr. McLAUGHLIN: Petition urging the Government of the United States to establish a national arboretum at Nebraska City, Nebr.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

702. Also, petition to establish a national arboretum in southeastern Nebraska; to the Committee on Agriculture.

703. Also, petition urging the allocation of the necessary funds for the construction of the Florence bridge across the Missouri River, Public Works Administration Docket 8837; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

704. By Mr. O'MALLEY: Memorial of the Wisconsin State Legislature, urging Congress to enact the pending $1,000,000,000 Home Owners' Loan Corporation bill "at the earliest possible moment"; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

705. By Mr. SABATH: Resolution of the supreme board of directors, Knights of Columbus, protesting conditions in Mexico and urging the United States Government to make representations of protest to Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

706. By Mr. SAUTHOFF: Joint resolution of the State of Wisconsin, memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact the pending $1,000,000,000 Home Owners' Loan Corporation bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

707. Also, joint resolution of the State of Wisconsin, memorializing Congress to enact a highway-safety program; to the Committee on Roads.

708. By Mr. SUTPHIN: Petition of the New Jersey Farm Bureau, resolving that the Agricultural Adjustment Act be amended so as to prohibit any farmer from receiving benefit payment for crop reduction unless the acreage taken out of production is not used to grow cash crops or is devoted only to soil-improvement crops; to the Committee on Agriculture.

709. By Mr. TARVER: Petitions of J. G. Gilbert and 20 other citizens, Mrs. F. B. Wood and 33 other citizens, Kate Bagwell and 19 other citizens of Floyd County, and Cynthia Maples and 36 other citizens of Walker County, Ga., favoring old-age pensions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

710. Also, petitions of Victoria Williams and 19 other citizens, Maymie Byars and 18 other citizens of Floyd County, W. H. Roberts and 36 other citizens of Murray County, Mrs. J. M. Maxwell and 19 other citizens, W. E. Holt and 16 other citizens of Chattooga County, C. J. Ellies and 14 other citizens, and Miss Frances Bragg and 14 other citizens of Douglas County, Ga., favoring old-age pensions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

711. Also, petitions of C. B. Ward and 82 other citizens of Bartow County; G. W. McGovin and 21 other citizens of Floyd

County; Thrower H. Maeger and 32 other citizens of Whitfield County; J. P. Brown, of Bartow County; Nora Taylor and 16 other citizens of Whitfield County; C. H. Moody and 29 other citizens of Polk County; and Sallie Poole and 36 other citizens of Haralson County, Ga., favoring old-age pensions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

712. Also, petitions of Bessie Moody and 14 other citizens of Polk County, J. A. Reese and 14 other citizens of Gordon County, John W. Cole and 14 other citizens of Haralson County, Mollie McFerren and 19 other citizens of Murray County, and C. I. Garner and 14 other citizens of Chattooga County, Ga., favoring old-age pensions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

713. By Mr. TRUAX: Petition of Townsend Club, No. 6, of Toledo, Ohio, by their president, George W. Steele, and secretary, A. B. Jones, urging the enactment into law of the Townsend old-age revolving pension plan; also the bill introduced for financing same; to the Committee on Labor.

714. Also, petition of William C. Bruckman and other citizens of Mansfield, Ohio, requesting that Congress enact into law an adequate unemployment insurance bill; to the Committee on Labor.

715. Also, petition of the Lions Club of Arcanum, Ohio, supporting the petition of the General Edward Sigerfoos Post, No. 156, of the American Legion of Arcanum, and the Ladies' Auxiliary of the General Edward Sigerfoos Post, No. 156, of the American Legion of Arcanum, Darke County, Ohio, and resolving that if such a movement receives favorable consideration in the erection of a building or some suitable memorial it should become the home of the General Edward Sigerfoos Post and the Ladies' Auxiliary of the Edward Sigerfoos Post of the American Legion of Arcanum, Darke County, Ohio, and the Arcanum Public Library; to the Committee on Appropriations.

716. Also, petition of members of the German Sick and Supporting Benefit Society, of Mansfield, Ohio, seeing the great suffering and privation in their city and all over the country due to low wages and unemployment, and seeing that due to the above circumstances thousands of members of societies and fraternal orders are suffering from sickness through undernourishment and are not able to pay their dues, causing the loss of their established surety and the ruination and destruction of societies and fraternal orders throughout the United States of America, do hereby resolve to petition their Congressmen to actively support to the fullest extent House bill 2827, and that a copy of this resolution be transmitted to each of their Congressmen and Senators; to the Committee on Labor.

717. By Mr. WITHROW: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, memorializing the Congress to enact a highway safety program; to the Committee on Roads.

718. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact the pending $1,000,000,000 Home Owners' Loan Corporation bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

719. By the SPEAKER: Petition of 19 citizens of San Miguel County, N. Mex., sponsoring the old-age-pension bill introduced by Representative WILL ROGERS, of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

720. By Mr. O'MALLEY: Memorial of the Wisconsin State Legislature, urging Congress to enact a highway safety program; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 4, 1935

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

Lord, in the stillness of this morning hour, we come to Thee for peace and the comfort of a quiet mind, that we may see beyond the things that seem to be and know each other as Thou knowest us.

Let kindly thoughts be clothed in words that shall bless and cheer the hearts of men who look to us with eyes of hope for guidance in these troublesome days. Remove from us all fear save only that of wounding Thee; give us the strength that comes to those who, as they walk with Thee, learn the true meaning of the discipline of self; keep us so serene above the fret of care, the dusty clouds and dissonances of life, that our patient strivings, being blest of Thee, may bring refreshment unto all Thy people.

We ask it in the name of Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

WILLIAM G. MCADOO, a Senator from the State of California, appeared in his seat today.

THE JOURNAL

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Thursday, January 31, 1935, when, on request of Mr. ROBINSON, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Haltigan, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 4442. An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 4983. An act to authorize a transfer of forest reservation lands in Forrest and Perry Counties, Miss., to the State of Mississippi or to the War Department, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 4304) to amend the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the Vice President.

SIGNING OF AN ENROLLED BILL

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair announces that under authority of the order of the Senate of Thursday last he signed, after the adjournment of the Senate on that day, the enrolled bill (S. 1175) to extend the functions of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for 2 years, and for other purposes, said bill having previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives and reported by the Committee on Enrolled Bills as having been examined and found truly enrolled, and that it was delivered to the committee to be presented to the President of the United States.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on January 31, 1935, that committee presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 1175) to extend the functions of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for 2 years, and for other purposes.

CALL OF THE ROLL

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Adams	Capper	Glass	Maloney
Ashurst	Caraway	Gore	Metcalf
Austin	Carey	Guffey	Minton
Bachman	Clark	Hale	Moore
Bailey	Connally	Harrison	Murphy
Bankhead	Coolidge	Hastings	Murray
Barbour	Copeland	Hatch	Neely
Barkley	Costigan	Hayden	Norbeck
Bilbo	Couzens	Johnson	Norris
Black	Cutting	Keyes	Nye
Bone	Davis	King	O'Mahoney
Borah	Dickinson	Lewis	Pittman
Brown	Donahey	Logan	Pope
Bulkley	Duffy	Lonergan	Radcliffe
Bulow	Fletcher	McAdoo	Reynolds
Burke	Frazier	McCarran	Robinson
Byrd	George	McGill	Russell
Byrnes	Gerry	McNary	Schall