

10002. By Mr. AYERS: Petition of William Mineschmidt and 63 other citizens of Gilt Edge, Mont.; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

10003. Also, petition of George H. Miller and 34 other citizens of Brussett and Butte Creek, Mont.; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

10004. Also, petition of Mark T. Selkirk and 25 other citizens of Columbus, Absarokee, Fishtail, and Limestone, Mont.; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

10005. Also, petition of William E. Ricketts and 78 other citizens of Belfry, Mont.; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

10006. By Mr. BEITER: Petition of the Common Council of the City of Buffalo, N. Y., approving legislation providing for a national lottery; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

10007. Also, petition of the Common Council of Buffalo, N. Y., approving legislation authorizing the Federal Government to contribute funds in the improvement of a section of the New York State Barge Canal; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

10008. By Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT: Petition of citizens of star routes nos. 76308 and 76510, Mariposa County, Calif., praying the enactment of pending legislation to grant increase of compensation in star-route contracts to an equal basis with that paid for other forms of mail transportation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

10009. By Mr. MEAD: Petition of the Common Council of the City of Buffalo, N. Y., relative to legislation authorizing the Federal Government to contribute funds in the improvement of a section of the New York State Barge Canal; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

10010. By Mr. MICHENER: Petition signed by J. H. Jones and 21 other residents of Jackson, Mich., urging that legislation be enacted at this session to indefinitely extend all existing star-route contracts and increase the compensation thereon to an equal basis with that paid for other forms of mail transportation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

10011. By Mr. REED of Illinois: Petition signed by Hugo F. Nelson and 127 residents of Woodstock, Ill., requesting passage of House bill 6472; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

10012. By Mr. LEWIS of Colorado: Petition of Esther I. Stump, corresponding secretary of the Highlands Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Denver, Colo., urging that the House of Representatives restore to the District of Columbia its prohibition law by passing, at the earliest possible moment, House bill 8739; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

10013. Also, petition of Louise M. Myers, chairman, temperance committee, Grant Avenue Methodist Church, Denver, Colo., urging that the House of Representatives restore to the District of Columbia its prohibition law by passing, at the earliest possible moment, House bill 8739; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

10014. By Mr. MOTT: Petition signed by J. C. Ponsler and 55 others of Florence, Oreg., urging the enactment of legislation placing star-route carriers on the same salary and working basis as rural carriers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

10015. Also, petition signed by Charles L. Walker and 94 others, of Washington County, Oreg., urging the enactment of legislation placing star-route carriers on the same salary and working basis as rural carriers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

10016. By Mr. PATTERSON: Petition of Rose Meador and 57 other citizens of the Third District of Kansas, favoring the enactment of the Guyer bill (H. R. 8739) for liquor control in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

10017. Also, petition of Mrs. D. V. Wagner and 30 other citizens of the Third District of Kansas, favoring the enactment of the Guyer bill (H. R. 8739) for liquor control in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

10018. Also, petition of Eva C. Wright and 87 other citizens of the Third District of Kansas, favoring the enactment of

the Guyer bill (H. R. 8739) for liquor control in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

10019. Also, petition of Ida Maxson and 425 other citizens of the Third District of Kansas, favoring the enactment of the Guyer bill (H. R. 8739) for the control of liquor in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

10020. By Mr. PFEIFER: Telegram from the Port of New York Authority, John E. Ramsey, general manager, New York City, opposing House bill 31 and Senate bill 1645; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

10021. Also, petition of the American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, New York City, concerning House bill 7901; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

10022. By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: Petition of citizens of Silverton, Colo., requesting passage of legislation indefinitely extending all existing contracts for star mail routes, etc.; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

## SENATE

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 10, 1936

(*Legislative day of Thursday, Jan. 16, 1936*)

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

### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. ROBINSON, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Friday, February 7, 1936, 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. Haligan, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10464) making appropriations to provide urgent supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, and for prior fiscal years, and for other purposes; that the House had receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 13 and 63 to the said bill and concurred therein, and that the House had receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 12, 24, 25, 33, and 62, and concurred therein, severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 10919) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

### CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. LEWIS. I note the absence of a quorum and move a roll call.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Adams	Byrd	Duffy	Johnson
Ashurst	Byrnes	Fletcher	Keyes
Austin	Caraway	Frazier	King
Bachman	Carey	George	La Follette
Bailey	Chavez	Gerry	Lewis
Barbour	Clark	Gibson	Logan
Barkley	Connally	Glass	Lonergan
Benson	Coolidge	Gore	McAdoo
Black	Copeland	Guffey	McCarran
Bone	Costigan	Hale	McGill
Borah	Couzens	Harrison	McKellar
Brown	Davis	Hastings	McNary
Bullock	Dickinson	Hatch	Maloney
Bulow	Dieterich	Hayden	Minton
Burke	Donahey	Hayden	Murphy

Murray	Pittman	Shipstead	Tydings
Neely	Radcliffe	Smith	Vandenberg
Norbeck	Reynolds	Steiner	Van Nuys
Norris	Robinson	Thomas, Utah	Wagner
Nye	Russell	Townsend	Walsh
O'Mahoney	Schwellenbach	Trammell	Wheeler
Overton	Sheppard	Truman	White

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER] is absent from the city attending the funeral of the late former Vice President Charles Curtis.

Mr. GORE. I announce that my colleague [Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma] is absent on account of illness in his family.

Mr. LEWIS. I announce the absence of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], occasioned by illness, and I further announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. POPE], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. MOORE] are necessarily detained from the Senate.

Mr. AUSTIN. I announce that the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. METCALF] is necessarily absent from the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-eight Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

#### SENATOR FROM LOUISIANA

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, several days ago I presented the credentials of the Senator-designate from Louisiana issued in the name of Mrs. HUEY P. LONG. I ask unanimous consent to withdraw those credentials and present other credentials issued in the name of Mrs. ROSE McCONNELL LONG. I send the credentials to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the credentials previously presented by the Senator from Louisiana will be considered as withdrawn, and the credentials now presented by him will be received, printed in the RECORD, and placed on file.

The credentials are as follows:

STATE OF LOUISIANA,  
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,  
Baton Rouge, January 31, 1936.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that, pursuant to the power vested in me by the Constitution of the United States and the laws of the State of Louisiana, I, James A. Noe, Governor of said State, do hereby appoint Mrs. ROSE McCONNELL LONG a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States until the vacancy therein, caused by the death of Senator Huey P. Long, is filled by election, as provided by law.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor, James A. Noe, and our seal hereto affixed at Baton Rouge this 31st day of January, A. D. 1936.

JAMES A. NOE,  
Governor.

By the Governor:  
[SEAL]

E. A. CONWAY,  
Secretary of State.

Mr. OVERTON. The Senator-designate from Louisiana is in the Chamber and is ready to take the oath of office.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator-designate will present herself at the desk to take the oath of office.

Mrs. LONG, escorted by Mr. OVERTON; advanced to the Vice President's desk; and the oath of office having been administered to her, she took her seat in the Senate.

#### ABRAHAM LINCOLN

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I desire to advise the Senate that on Wednesday next, as soon as possible after the assembling of the Senate, I shall ask recognition to deliver a short address on Abraham Lincoln.

#### SUPPLEMENTAL DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following action of the House of Representatives:

#### IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, UNITED STATES,

February 7, 1936.

*Resolved*, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate nos. 13 and 63 to the bill (H. R. 10464) making appropriations to provide urgent supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, and for prior fiscal years, and for other purposes, and concur therein.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate no. 12 to the said bill and concur therein with the following amendments:

In line 11 of the matter inserted by said amendment, after "approved", insert "February —, 1936."

In the last line of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out "June 30, 1936," and insert "January 1, 1937."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate no. 24 to said bill and concur therein with the following amendment:

In line 12 of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out "to be."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate no. 25 to said bill and concur therein with the following amendment:

In line 2 of the matter inserted by said amendment, after "available", insert "for such purpose."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate no. 33 to said bill and concur therein with the following amendment:

In line 2 of the matter inserted by said amendment, after "That", insert "during the fiscal years 1936 and 1937."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate no. 62 to said bill and concur therein with the following amendment:

In line 7 of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out "to States."

Mr. ADAMS. I move that the Senate agree to the amendments of the House of Representatives to the amendments of the Senate numbered 12, 24, 25, 33, and 62.

The motion was agreed to.

#### PROCEEDINGS ARISING UNDER THE CUSTOMS OR INTERNAL-REVENUE LAWS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to give precedence to civil and criminal proceedings arising under the customs or internal-revenue laws which involve fraud upon the revenues of the United States, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### TRADE RELATIONS WITH THE PHILIPPINES

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting copy of a resolution received from the Municipal Council of Solsona, Ilocos Norte, P. I., relative to trade relations between the United States and the Philippine Islands, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

#### WILLIAM KING RICHARDSON v. THE UNITED STATES

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Chief Clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting, pursuant to order of the court, a certified copy of the court's opinion in the case of William King Richardson against the United States (Congressional Reference No. 17746), which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

#### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to enact suitable legislation to reduce tenancy through the acquisition of farms by deserving tenants and landless citizens

Whereas the effects of tenancy upon soil fertility, crop rotation, soil erosion, and farm diversification are admittedly evil and tend to unbalance farm crop production and oftentimes serve to pile up huge surpluses of certain basic farm commodities; and

Whereas the percentage of tenancy in the United States has, according to competent authority, increased within the last 50 years from 26 percent of the total number of farmers to 42 percent as of today and bids fair to increase progressively in the future unless steps be speedily taken; and

Whereas home ownership has ever proved to be the shortest cut to individual contentment, initiative, and resourcefulness, as well as the best antidote for communism, crime, and social turmoil and confusion; and

Whereas the more progressive countries of Europe have long since enacted legislation to reduce tenancy by loaning deserving individuals sums wherewith to buy land at low rates of interest spread over an amortization period of 40 to 60 years; and

Whereas bills are now before the United States Congress the purpose of which is to bring about similar legislation for the welfare of the American people and Nation: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved* by the South Carolina House of Representatives (the senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States be, and hereby is, petitioned and memorialized to enact at this session of the Congress such legislation as will tend to decrease tenancy among the American farmers and make it possible for any deserving but landless person to acquire land through loans made at low rates of interest and running over a long period of years, to the

end that the now landless man may sit with pride and dignity beneath the shade of his own vine and fig tree and enjoy the blessings of the more abundant and joyful life attendant upon home ownership, the while the whole social fabric of the American people is made thereby stronger and more enduring; be it further

*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be forthwith dispatched to the respective presiding officers of the two branches of the United States Congress, to each and every Member of each of these branches from the State of South Carolina, and to Senator BANKHEAD, of Alabama, and Representative MARVIN JONES, of Texas.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate a resolution of the Wake County (N. C.) Junior Bar Association, favoring the enactment of House Joint Resolution 237, for the establishment of a trust fund to be known as the Oliver Wendell Holmes Memorial Fund, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the National Aeronautic Association in convention assembled at Washington, D. C., favoring the creation by the Senate of a standing committee on civil aviation, which was referred to the Committee on Rules.

Mr. WALSH presented a resolution adopted by the Cambridge (Mass.) Industrial Association, protesting against the enactment of legislation providing for the setting up of a Government corporation to acquire the railroads of the country, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Grand Lodge of Massachusetts, Order Sons of Italy in America, at Boston, Mass., protesting against further changes in the practice and policy of American neutrality, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. COPELAND presented a resolution of Hankins Local, Dairymen's League Cooperative Association, of Fremont Center, N. Y., favoring the imposition of a tax of 5 cents per pound on all fats used in the production of oleomargarine, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a resolution adopted by Warren G. Harding Council No. 118, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Mineola, N. Y., favoring the enactment of legislation for the deportation of habitual alien criminals and other alien law violators, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a resolution of the board of directors of the Batavia (N. Y.) Chamber of Commerce, protesting against the enactment of legislation providing for the Government ownership of railroads, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented the following concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of New York, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

Whereas in January 1935 the Senate and the Assembly of the State of New York unanimously passed the following resolution: "Whereas the comparatively uncontrolled market of firearms within the State has made it possible for almost any person to purchase any type of firearm; and

"Whereas persons irresponsible and criminal have been able to purchase firearms illegally within the State with consequent tragic results to organized society; and

"Whereas due to the constitutional inability of the State by reason of the commerce clause contained in the United States Constitution to register the sale of firearms at their point of manufacture it has been impossible to pass laws which would effectively stop the illegal sale and possession of firearms; and

"Whereas the State legislature could enact effective laws in this regard for the benefit and safeguarding of the public were the Federal Government to pass enabling laws permitting the State so to act: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved* (if the assembly concur), That the Federal Government be, and hereby is, respectfully memorialized 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, serial number, name of consignee, and the name of the purchaser; and be it further

*Resolved*, That a copy of this concurrent resolution be, upon passage, sent to the Clerk of the House of Representatives at Washington, the Secretary of the Senate, the Attorney General of the

United States, the Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, and to each Member of the House of Representatives and the Senate elected from this State"; and

Whereas to date the Federal Government has passed no legislation which will give this State the right to pass laws for the protection of its citizens in connection with the sale of firearms manufactured in another State; and

Whereas the Federal Government has also not given the Department of Justice or the Interstate Commerce Commission the right to make rules which will protect the citizens of every State as far as the sale of firearms manufactured in other States is concerned; and

Whereas the situation regarding the illegal sale of firearms is still critical, due to the fact that the same irresponsible and criminal-intent persons can still purchase firearms in an uncontrolled market to the detriment of the citizens of this State: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved* (if the assembly concur), That the Federal Government be again memorialized to enact such laws which will give this State the right to enact legislation which will be a protection to the citizens of this State; and be it further

*Resolved*, That a copy of this concurrent resolution be sent to the Clerk of the House of Representatives, the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Attorney General of the United States, the Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, and to each Member of the House of Representatives and the Senate elected from this State.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. BAILEY, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 4925) to authorize and direct the Comptroller General to settle and allow the claim of George P. Money for fees for services rendered, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1533) thereon.

Mr. KING, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill (S. 3450) to regulate the sales of goods in the District of Columbia, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1534) thereon.

#### ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on February 7, 1936, that committee presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills and joint resolution:

S. 166. An act for the relief of Jack Doyle;  
S. 246. An act for the relief of Elmer Blair;  
S. 272. An act for the relief of William Frank Lipps;  
S. 423. An act for the relief of Lynn Brothers' Benevolent Hospital;

S. 889. An act for the relief of Albert A. Marquardt;  
S. 1010. An act for the relief of Fred Edward Nordstrom;  
S. 1176. An act for the relief of Thomas A. Coyne;  
S. 1298. An act for the relief of John Z. Lowe;  
S. 1950. An act for the relief of the estate of Julius Crisler;  
S. 2044. An act for the relief of the Hartford-Connecticut Trust Co., Inc.;

S. 2166. An act for the relief of Ludwig Larson;  
S. 2321. An act for the relief of S. M. Price;  
S. 2323. An act for the relief of Ida C. Buckson, executrix of E. C. Buckson, deceased;

S. 2343. An act for the relief of Maj. Edwin F. Ely, Finance Department; Capt. Reyburn Engles, Quartermaster Corps; and others;

S. 2691. An act for the relief of E. E. Sullivan;  
S. 2741. An act for the relief of Maj. Joseph H. Hickey;  
S. 2897. An act for the relief of Lt. Robert A. J. English, United States Navy;

S. 3020. An act for the relief of A. E. Taplin;  
S. 3186. An act for the relief of Edward H. Karg;

S. 3934. An act to repeal the Kerr Tobacco Act, the Bankhead Cotton Act of 1934, and the Potato Act of 1935; and

S. J. Res. 169. Joint resolution granting permission to Hugh S. Cumming, Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service; John D. Long, medical director, United States Public Health Service; Bolivar J. Lloyd, medical director, United States Public Health Service; and Clifford R. Eskey, surgeon, United States Public Health Service, to accept and wear certain decorations bestowed upon them by the Governments of Ecuador, Chile, Peru, and Cuba.

#### EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

Mr. MCKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, reported favorably the nominations of sundry postmasters.

He also, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported favorably the nomination of Thomas D. Rose, of North Carolina, to be State engineer inspector for the Public Works Administration in North Carolina.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. The reports will be placed on the Executive Calendar.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. BARBOUR:

A bill (S. 3962) for the relief of the First, Second, and Third National Steamship Cos.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SCHWELLENBACH:

A bill (S. 3963) for the relief of Dean Wilson; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 3964) granting a pension to Jacob R. Stiltner; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. NEELY:

A bill (S. 3965) granting a pension to Hosea F. Dearth;

A bill (S. 3966) granting an increase of pension to Anzina L. Harper;

A bill (S. 3967) granting a pension to Joseph J. McNeal;

A bill (S. 3968) granting a pension to Sarah M. Waugh; and

A bill (S. 3969) granting a pension to Roy Wilcox; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. COPELAND:

(By request.) A bill (S. 3970) for the relief of Frank Aquilina (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 3971) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the St. Lawrence River at or near Ogdensburg, N. Y.; to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 3972) granting an increase of pension to Nellie Trapp;

A bill (S. 3973) granting an increase of pension to Kate O'Donnell Wood; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

A bill (S. 3974) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide more effectively for the national defense by increasing the efficiency of the Air Corps of the Army of the United States, and for other purposes", approved July 2, 1926; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KING:

A bill (S. 3975) to authorize the rewriting of the Code of the District of Columbia;

A bill (S. 3976) to amend the act approved February 27, 1931, known as the District of Columbia Traffic Act; and

A bill (S. 3977) to authorize the Washington Gas Light Co. to alter its corporate structure, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. FLETCHER:

A bill (S. 3978) relating to taxation of shares of preferred stock, capital notes, and debentures of banks while owned by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and reaffirming their immunity; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GORE:

A bill (S. 3979) authorizing the President to invite the States of the Union and foreign countries to participate in the International Petroleum Exposition at Tulsa, Okla., to be held May 16 to May 23, 1936, inclusive; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. BULKLEY:

A bill (S. 3980) for the relief of Evica Arbutina; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MURRAY:

A bill (S. 3981) for the relief of William Hays Hammond; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHIPSTEAD:

A bill (S. 3982) to authorize the sale and conveyance by the Department of the Interior to the State of Minnesota of the southwest quarter northwest quarter section 3, township 159 north, range 35 west, fifth principal meridian, in the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION

MR. LEWIS. Mr. President, I ask the Senate to permit me to tender, by request, a proposed constitutional amendment sent to me by an eminent authority on constitutional law, the head of one of the colleges of Illinois. I take the liberty of asking that the joint resolution be printed in the RECORD.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the joint resolution will be received, printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 208) for the purpose of restricting the application of section 1 of article 14 of amendment to the Constitution of the United States was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

Senate Joint Resolution 208

Joint resolution for the purpose of restricting the application of section 1 of article XIV of amendment to the Constitution of the United States

Whereas the fourteenth amendment of the Constitution of the United States was adopted, among other purposes, for the purpose of establishing and securing rights of citizens of the United States, born or naturalized therein, and did not aim to establish or preserve rights of other persons than citizens of the United States; and

Whereas the provisions of section 1 of this amendment have been extended by judicial decision to fictitious and artificial persons, not citizens of the United States and incapable of being born or naturalized in the United States, resulting in grave consequences to the economic, social, and political institutions of the United States: Therefore be it

*Resolved by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following amendment to the Constitution of the United States be, and hereby is, proposed to the States, to become valid as part of said Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of the several States, as provided in the Constitution:*

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. The provisions of section 1 of the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States shall be held to apply only to natural persons and not to corporate or other artificial persons created by law.

"Sec. 2. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution within 7 years from the date of the submission hereof to the States by the Congress."

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 10919) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

CHANGES OF REFERENCE

On motion of Mr. KING, the Committee on the District of Columbia was discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 3855) to amend the act entitled "An act to incorporate the National Education Association of the United States", approved June 30, 1906, as amended, and it was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

On motion of Mr. NEELY, the Committee on Pensions was discharged from the further consideration of the following bills, and they were referred to the Committee on Finance:

S. 976. A bill granting a pension to Golda Stump Darr; and

S. 3305. A bill granting a pension to Modie A. Quick.

AGRICULTURAL RELIEF—AMENDMENT

MR. WHEELER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 3780) to make further provision for the conservation and proper utilization of the soil resources of the Nation, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT TO INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL

MR. GERRY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 9863, the independent offices appropriation bill, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed, as follows:

On page 41, line 2, to insert the following:

"The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is hereby authorized and directed to transfer \$34,218.75 of the funds of the Veterans' Administration for the fiscal year 1936 to the Navy Department, for disbursement by it under the various headings of its applicable appropriations, for 25 beds at the Newport Naval Hospital, Newport, R. I., for the care and treatment of beneficiaries of the Veterans' Administration, including minor repairs and improvements of existing facilities under their jurisdiction necessary to such care and treatment."

## COMMANDER ALFRED HART MILES, UNITED STATES NAVY

Mr. BYRD submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 232), which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Naval Affairs, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete investigation into the reasons why Commander Alfred Hart Miles, United States Navy, was not selected for promotion. The committee shall report to the Senate as soon as practicable the results of its investigation.

## WORLD PEACE AND THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an interesting and able address delivered by the Senator from Utah [MR. THOMAS] at the annual dinner of the League of Nations Association at the Biltmore Hotel, New York City, on February 7.

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

My old Greek teacher, at the end of a class discussion one day, remarked, "If Homer did not write the Iliad, another man by the name of Homer did." So with the world as it is today and has been since 1918, if we had not had the League of Nations, we would have had a union of states or a society of nations for consultation. The old story told, I believe, by Irving Fisher, in 1920, of the League purposes is still the best one of its subject, and illustrates better than any what our world gone askew has been doing since 1918. A darky soldier boy coming down the gangplank on leave in 1918 was asked when the war was going to be over. "In 101 years," he said. "It will take 1 year to lick the Germans and 100 years to wind up the barbed wire." The whipping of the Germans signified the end of fighting, and the barbed-wire winding may be expected to prove to be merely a setting of the stage for a world of peaceful processes.

The function of the League of Nations Association is primarily educational. The success of the League itself must in its final analysis rest upon common consent. All human institutions that are social in their nature rest, too, on common consent. War is possible between nations today only when there can be aroused a unity for its support. The success of free government and the success of peaceful processes rest upon the same basis, therefore, as war. One accepts force backed up by unquestioning obedience as its motive power; the other accepts reason supported by knowledge as its method of carrying on. One, therefore, seems, to the thoughtless, to be strong; the other appears weak. But it is not. So accustomed have men become to accepting the mere appearance of force as being force itself that they have become poor at weighing the elements which hold men together.

In America, governed as we are by a Constitution whose ultimate success rests upon the thin thread of fair play, we have lost the ability to appreciate the power of that simple idea. Our Constitution and our Government adhere, not because we have a President who is Commander in Chief of an Army and a Navy, not because we have a Supreme Court that has been permitted to make itself able to discommode and upset the even tenor of Congresses and administrations, not because we have a Congress which can override a President's veto or can tax everyone for the benefit of the few or a few for the benefit of all—but our Constitution survives just because of the plain spirit of fair play which keeps each branch of a coordinated government in bounds. Our Constitution can be brought to an end in scores of ways. The President can force Congress. He can ignore the opinion of the Supreme Court. He can even take us into war before we may stop him. But these things he does not do. Is it his oath that holds him back? Some may think so, but it is not. It is the simple fact of fair play. Congress can refuse to appropriate. The Senate can refuse to sustain judges. Either action would destroy our Constitution. The Supreme Court might become wholly legislative in its nature and strike down until it destroys. I emphasize these points because my theme tonight deals with the subject of what should be our attitude. It should be one seeking and spreading knowledge, knowing that only that which is built in accordance with such truths as have proved themselves to be fundamental to man's social and political progress is the sure foundation on which to build lastingly.

The League of Nations, call it by whatever name you wish, is historically and logically built upon and built out of conditions which make it inevitable. Accept in the fullest every criticism you may hear against it. Call it a court of intrigue. Assume that the men who make the League function are insincere, selfish, dominated by great states or conspiring groups. Call it a league for war instead of a league for peace. Say that it is brave in the Italian case because it is dominated by Great Britain, and that it was weak in the Japanese case because of English indifference. Accept all the loose gossip, all the thoughtless tales about Geneva, its suspicious influences, and its ambitions. Point out the hypocrisy of the mandate system, the political domination of the World Court. Call the League a union of victors. Those who opposed a harsh peace have failed to see that the League has been the greatest of all tempering influences. In less than 7 years after the signing of the treaty, Germany, the chief of the vanquished sat with equality on the Council. That the actions of the leading victors in refusing to continue a tempering attitude is not a reflection on the League but merely a condemnation of the backward thinking of the victor states.

Think up all the ill you have heard in the last 17 years and you have still not destroyed the fact of the League. There she stands a mountain of strength for potential good. Shall we love it or shall we hate it? Do neither. We might as well hate or love the Rocky Mountains. Those of us who live among the mountains know their worth, their strength, and appreciate their danger. We do not hate them, we do not love them, we use them. We put their wealth to the good of man. Their strength gives men courage to aspire. Men who master themselves in the mountains never go backward. The League is established among the mountains. Nations and people will go up to her and learn the worth of peace. The League stands a monument in the earth. What shall it be, a monument for service in a better way of doing things, or shall it stand a monument to a lost cause, an ideal for which men aspired but could not attain, a desire of nations doomed to wait because men without vision rule in the earth? How long will the spirit of good strive in the hearts of men to no avail?

Without the League the question of suggesting a way to discover world-wide public opinion remains unanswered. You are still without a medium for collective action. You have still not invented a plan where international disputes can be so readily settled. Abolish the League and all its agencies, and you will find that much which the League's many institutions are doing would survive and in some form would remain even if its name were lost. The world surely wants a registry for treaties. We would never want to go back to the day of official recognition of secret treaties. We would not like to see those things which the international labor office has accomplished wiped out of our international experience. No one wants to repeal the decisions of the World Court. No one can think of a better way than the League's way of taking care of the repatriation of lost persons. Everyone is happy over the world-wide advancement of theories concerning the betterment of women and children. All commend the League for its efforts in control of drug and opium traffic and in curbing slave trade. The League's record in the Saar is a source of pride and proves again that nations can cooperate. Minority populations now have standing in the world. The mandate theory of trusteeship is an addition to international stewardship which may become the key through which problems of backward peoples may be solved. It is only under League auspices that the problem of a homeland for the Jews will be attained. Thanks to the League we today are witnesses of the fulfillment of the words of the prophets of old, for verily, the Jews by thousands are returning to build Jerusalem, as was foretold, under the auspices of the gentle nations. The spiritual blessings to the whole world which will follow in the wake of a restored Jerusalem cannot be measured.

Disarmament conferences have failed, let us grant, and the League has not been perfect. No one is satisfied. Still, every thoughtful person, even though biased because of some local allegiance, knows that its record in the light of other social and political accomplishments is one which, if prophesied 16 or 17 years ago, would have been called an optimistic vision of the first order and the prophet one whose zeal had the better of his judgment.

Now, what should be our attitude toward the League? I say simply one of appreciation. We have rights in the League. We have active membership in many of its institutions and committees. We have sustaining memberships in some and not in others. We do not have to have membership in the Council or in the Assembly. We need not help pay the expenses of the secretariat; and with public sentiment as it seems to be in the United States, I honestly believe that we should gain nothing by joining tomorrow, because our contribution would be little, just as has been our contribution to some recent conferences because our support has been, and therefore would be, half-hearted. If leaders of public life in America are mere sentimentalists, if our diplomatists are amateurs, if our soldiers and sailors are citizens first and soldiers afterward—if, in other words, all those governmental activities which are recognized as professional in other states are mere amateur concerns with us—it may be well for us to keep away; because, if all international questions are settled by intrigue, by wit, by deception, I think we had better stay over in our pure atmosphere of amateurism; but let us honestly appreciate that which we really are.

After all is said, what are we going to do about it? The success of the League of Nations rests upon understanding, appreciation, and a conviction that the contributions which its institutions offer for making the world better and man's life in the world broader are essential. Until the American people can be convinced that this is the case, we had better remain where we are.

That the American people shall be brought to the place where an appreciation of the attitudes which I have suggested is possible is your task and my task. This can come only by work and by honest education. In the meantime the League will very well take care of itself. It is a living and growing institution. It need not be exacting in its demands that peace be preserved in accordance with its ideas about how peace should be preserved. Its objectives are bigger than it, itself, is. It can stand to be in the background so long as that for which it stands goes forward. Do you remember how Dr. Nitobe saved the situation in the Corfu affair? The League was younger then than it is today. It had not learned how to take punishment. It thought that it had a face to be saved, and when the spokesman for the Italian Government refused to put his case before the council of the League, but offered to present it to the Council of Ambassadors, Nitobe laid down the great dictum that the purpose of the League was to

maintain peace and prevent war. It was not necessarily interested in the method. In other words, the objective of this great institution, or I should say more correctly, of these great institutions, and not the method is the important thing. The League should be thought of as a means and not an end. It exists to minister, not to be ministered to. It has no face to save, it has no face that needs to be saved; in fact, it has no face at all. It exists to save the faces of its member states. This is the important consideration. The League is a society serving many nations, not many nations serving a society. It is the nations and not the League that are to be stressed. Just as I wish individuals to be themselves I want nations and national cultures to remain themselves, each nation establishing and promoting its own happiness in accordance with its own idea of happiness. The League must never be a single-willed institution. It is merely a medium through which many wills may express themselves, their differences being ironed out through discussion, and unity reached only as it is reached in a parliament or a congress in our America under our Constitution, in a spirit of fair play. It is the principles behind the League that count and not the League form. Our contention, therefore, is for principles and not for words.

Those who are familiar with the history of this country know of our early failures in attaining unity. At length we succeeded in making one nation out of many. The problem of bringing about a world-wide cooperative action is not the problem of creating one nation out of many; it is merely the problem of establishing media through which the many nations may speak in unity when occasions for such cooperative wills arise. The bond which affords the assertion of a collective will need not be great. International police power does not need any army or a navy to enforce its will. It needs only the respect for a reasoned opinion such as men now give a court. It is the acceptance of the method that commands the respect, not the imagined force that probably could not be used even if it were tried. Police power is not an active force. It is a concept and seldom does it become anything else. All States accede to public opinion or reasoned judgment most of the time, so why not do it all the time? The peaceful process is just as strong as the warlike one and is more lasting.

Knowing, then, that in every attempt at international cooperative action our national behavior has been a reluctant, almost unwilling, relatively impotent, and, too often, distrustful delegation of but little power or authority, we are confronted with the question, What are we going to do about it?

Fortunately nations may learn by experience. The lesson that jealousy and greed do not pay was learned in the eighteenth century, if not fully accepted. In 1918 and the years that followed every nation on the face of the globe either learned a new lesson or became conscious for the first time in their lives of an old truth, that wars do not pay.

If we do have one agency or a dozen agencies or a hundred agencies that are honestly trying to preserve the peace, we should know what to do for them. We know that we cannot take everything from them and contribute nothing. If everyone wants to take something from them and to put nothing into them, we know that they will fail, because we have seen them fail before. We must be less conscious of our rights and more conscious of our duties. With those agencies for the preservation of peace, unity, and understanding, we must not tinker. It is ungracious to embarrass a pauper by asking him for alms. It should be nationally impolite to pluck and pull at anything symbolizing a community of interest with demands that dull and deaden hoped-for results.

Do we not today know better than to take all and give nothing? We know what should be done. But having foolishly believed that war could beget peace, our shattered faith now holds us back. We blame the institution instead of the method used in the institution. We still claim we have the ideal but say that men and nations are not big enough to live up to the ideal. We know that our present agencies of peace, strengthened slightly by experience, will be all that we may expect to have for some time to come. Weak as they appear, no one would destroy the ideal behind them. No thoughtful person would belittle the loss to the world if they ceased to exist. We know that too much taking and too little giving, too much jealousy and too little unselfishness, too much greed and too little bounty will break them. International good will will cause it them to succeed. There is no deficiency that cannot be overcome by a right attitude.

Let us not be afraid of international conversation. An exchange of thought was probably man's first cooperative step in building civilization. A united will for peace can be developed in no other way. Peace must rest on understanding. Peace cannot grow; it must be developed. As long as the constitutions of the nations of the world rest on force, nations can slip into war. War, therefore, can come without plan. Peace, though, can remain only by restraint and be made lasting only by conscious effort.

Peace-sustaining conversation is worth much more than the international hate-provoking action. The one unites us in peaceful endeavor, the other joins us in war. Why is it that America has been backward in joining with other nations in peaceful processes but has united with all her strength in giving her blood and wealth in war? History answers the question for us. It is easy to join in hating but hard to join in loving. If we cannot go the whole way and love our neighbor, let us at least appreciate him. If we will appreciate him, we will refrain from hating him, and in time we may join for love quite as readily as we have joined for hate.

War really has no place in our modern international scheme, because every purpose which a modern nation has can be accomplished better by some other medium or instrument. When we become

thoughtful about the lessons of the last war we find that not a single principle for which men fought was accomplished. Some men might have inwardly accepted the theory of the sordid destruction of a neighbor nation, but this no statesman dared to admit to his people. Our American President even denied being at war with the German people. Our Government told our people and the German people, too, that we were at war only with the rulers of Germany. We may become sordid and say that that idea was put forth by our President to undermine the morale of the German Army, and it was so used, but you know and I know that mere hatred of our fellow man had been bred out of American minds and hearts. We had too many German neighbors, too many German wives, husbands, fathers, and mothers for us to want to kill because of a nationalistic hate. We could be made to fight only for a principle and only for a cause. We fought to save democracy. We fought to end war. You may today laugh at the logic we accepted. But the fact remains that the late war was never sordid in its spirit. It was made to seem even sweet, and mothers were happy in the sacrifices they had to offer.

We all now know that the principles for which we fought failed of attainment. Nay more, the principles we attempted to attain cannot be attained by war. We cannot build by destroying. We cannot give life by killing. We cannot make the world safe for democracy by fighting, because the very essence of democracy depends upon peaceful processes. How can we bring equality among men in a community where only force is recognized? How can justice prevail if only the mighty speak? How can the rights of a minority be preserved if the majority rules by force? War is a contest of physical power. Democracy depends upon an intellectual and spiritual concept of live and let live. The futility of war is evident to all.

In the days when Newton's theory dominated thought, liberty was in theory maintained by a balance. It was assumed that the forces in government were in constant opposition. The laws relating to the push and the pull in nature were transplanted and thought of as being fundamental, and they actually did dominate man in his thoughts about himself and other men. When the Darwinian theory became the controlling thought men beheld themselves and judged mankind a growing organism or they saw man himself as an evolving animal. From this observation came the theory of change which brought about the acceptance of war on the basis of the survival of the fittest or which supported the concept of peace on the basis of cooperation and mutual aid. The Darwinian theory lent itself to two opposing attitudes, one that we win by combat, the other that we go forward by mutual endeavor.

Today our fundamental thought is probably based on Einstein, and we are faced with a present deduction that all things are relative and that the absolute is gone. Perfection is attainable but never attained. This brings us, of course, to the social human philosophy of the relative good—not the highest good as an absolute, but the best good as an objective. There is some hope if we can bring about its universal acceptance. We must break down the absolutes if good will is to reign in the earth. An absolute in international clash justifies us in killing a man because he is a Frenchman, or because he is an Italian, or because he is a Britisher! What an indictment of civilized thinking!

What, then, should be our attitude? It must be built upon the great universals, upon a recognition of a fact that the thinking, conscious part of humanity has been more of a unit than we have even let ourselves dream. We have stressed wars without emphasizing that in these conflicts each fight has been a fight for a right which on analysis proves that the aim of each was the same. Men do not fight until someone asks another to do something he himself would not do. Nations, like men, only fight when one insists upon the other submitting to something or doing something the demanding nation itself would not submit to or would not do. War is a clash of two rights, not a fight between wrong and right. In the history of nations not one has ever fought in defense of wrong.

In the migrations and the spreadings of various peoples over the globe the objectives have been the same more often than they have been different. We talk of the rise and the destruction of civilizations. What do we mean? Let us see. Man by 1900 A. D. had evolved three concepts which marked him a creature different from man 2,000 years before. The struggle for the discovery of the concept of the individual had made some progress among the Hebrews and the Greeks, but it did not find its fulfillment until Jesus gave us the key. In the wake of this discovery the church had introduced the concept of pity in the world. The letter of an ordinary husband who lived in Alexandria during its greatest days and who had left home to get work, written to his wife said: "When I get some pay I'll send you some of it. When the baby is born if it is a boy raise it and feed it; if it is a girl, throw it out." The father who wrote that letter meant it. The mother was not surprised in its contents nor was she shocked. Religious thinkers had not evolved and developed the theory of the right to life. Much later political thinkers made life a right inherent in man, and the western civilized world standard by 1900 recognized that life was something of which a person should not be deprived without cause.

In the enlargement of the idea of the individual and the individual's right to live, came an evolution of the theory of private property. Men not only said, "this is I", but they also said, "this is mine", and other men respected such assertions. In war time this developed to the extent that certain persons and property were not subject to capture or destruction and certain other property should be paid for when taken. In our war killings we divided human beings into classes, because the right of life as

such was respected and we knew that a combatant and a non-combatant had respective rights. The acme of this remarkable evolution of concept and practice came during the Japanese-Russian War in the siege of Port Arthur. The Russian fleet had bottled itself in the harbor. The harbor was protected by high hills; the city itself was protected by hills. The Japanese were faced with the necessity of destroying the Russian fleet before the arrival of Russia's European fleet in Asiatic waters. The fleet could have been easily destroyed by hurling bombs over the mountains, but in doing so private property would have been exposed to destruction, and noncombatants, women, and children killed. So high had we developed the theories of these concepts which we call good, that the Japanese sacrificed regiment after regiment and brigade after brigade in the taking of a high hill so that the exact location of the war ships could be signaled before the Japanese fleet out of the harbor hurled destructive bombs over the mountains on the bottled-up Russian ships.

The World War came. Armies ceased to fight armies. Instead, nations fought nations. A noncombatant was a potential combatant and therefore subject to destruction. The World War ended, and an ideal was crushed. Then came Chapel, the proof that an ideal was dead. Chapel, a Chinese incident in a nonlegal war, proved the point. Planes soared through the heavens and dropped bombs. Were they aimed at the military? No. Was there any consideration of the noncombatants or private property? There was not. An American naval officer who witnessed the bombing was asked, "What about the women and children?" His reply was that it was just too bad. But the saddest picture of all came when the foreign element in the city of Shanghai went to the tops of the high buildings with field glasses to witness the bombing as they would a public game. Civilization slipped. It has slipped, and one result of that slipping is the Ethiopian war. If we analyze again we find the reactions much the same as they always have been—one general element of the world seeking for a spread of a universal good, and a particular element contesting that spread.

Of course, civilization as such has not slipped and cannot be destroyed. Our civilization, for example, rests upon three things—cereal food, domestic animals, and the wheel. But there is more to civilization than these great bases. There are ideals. Civilization may be made to slip through the destruction of ideals. The mere destruction of men and places does not necessarily count, for men die and places decay. But ideals live on.

Peace and life become secure to man as the peaceful places broaden and man is free to go and come. The early Greeks could not cooperate because they assumed that the perfect good could be found in the city-state. The Hellenistic Greek, even with the theory and the example of Alexander and the spreading of the Greek language over the globe and the birth of the imperial concept, found that the particular somewhere must be made to suffer even though the universal became the accepted good. To read of cosmopolitan Alexandria is to read of the cosmopolitan cities of today. Jew hunting attracted Egypt's Alexandria as it does Hitler's Germany. Tremendous conflicts between the particular and the universal are shown in simple things. A name illustrates the point. Jewish children in Alexandria were often named Isidore. Think of it—a Hebrew naming his baby a Greek name which meant "lover of the Egyptian god Isis"! That is America in 1936. There are enough Isidores in America today to make a city. Each, Jew or Christian, would deny being a lover of a heathen Egyptian goddess. Consider how easy the change was in Hellenistic time, and you will call it good. Where do we turn to find the survival of the particular or the narrow anywhere? History shows that it only occurs when artificially created for a purpose. In the political theory developed, it happens when it is for war purposes. Men mingle, philosophies fuse, religion blends, life is complex, culture is world-wide, thought transcends all barriers. The white man in his spread over the world has carried "pidgin" English as well as gunpowder and whisky. Mission labor has not been in vain. The zeal to sell has taken the salesman into every corner. In fact, the world's salesmen today, be they white, yellow, or brown, are seeking a prospective buyer with all the zeal with which the white man chased the last Tasmanian. When the last Tasmanian was shot, I have been told, it made news as great as the act of a man biting a dog ever did. But it was the word "last" that made the news, not the shooting or the death of a fellow human being.

In Bavaria we came to a wayside shrine with its crucifix and its lesson in brotherly love. Within a few feet of this proclamation of peace on earth and good will to men there stood a shrine of hate, a sign which read, "Jews move on; you are not wanted here." Thus the age-old contest between those who sought the good for all against those who sought good for a part is still with us.

On and on we might drift, for my theme is age-old. The striving for the universal and a medium through which it might find expression is not new. It has always been the aim of the thoughtful. If we could only appreciate that fact we could change our world today just as it has been changed in the past. Many times our world has become close to attaining a world-wide outlook. Alexander might have done it. The Han dynasty, Chandrapaka, Asoka, and the Caesars reflected thought and approached it in actual accomplishment. The universal church might have accomplished it. Ancient China tried, but when collective action contested with balance of power, the universal ideal went afoul just as in the Hellenic world the sloganized perfection of the city state would not give way to the bigger ideal. Each time the problem is the same. And in this we seem to have struck a good universal. We ourselves have been willing to join for war, but we insist upon independent action when the aim is peace. It is

easier to agree to disagree than it is to unite in accomplishing ends which we acknowledge to be identical. Is not our problem today the age-old one? Sophocles makes Antigone say, "Not to join in hating but to join in loving." Cannot the people of the world be made to see that joining for hate is bad, but that joining for love is good?

Tonight we have placed the structure for world peace not upon a form, although we know its permanent growth can be maintained only through institutional development. Our contention for principles led us to advocate that we join for good in the future as we have joined for ill in the past. Never should we be disheartened about slow growth. New League concepts are evolving from day to day, and as they grow new world theory develops. Japan left the League, but in her leaving a new League idea is given birth. Japan still claims rights at Geneva. She was a signer of the treaty, and she remains a member of the sisterhood of states. The League took its first collective action when it moved to restrain Italy, but all members did not join. Austria and Hungary remained aloof from sanctions. Thus is answered, and satisfactorily answered, the question of whether the theory of neutrality remains part of the world's peaceful process, and thus is answered in the affirmative the question whether a League member may remain neutral when the League takes joint action. Theories for better understanding take years in bearing fruit. We now have the British Commonwealth of Nations. The fundamental principle upon which the Commonwealth rests is one on which the Thirteen Colonies insisted.

England would not in 1776 grant the Colonies the promise that Parliament or the Crown would not veto the acts of our colonial governments, and Jefferson in the Declaration of Independence thundered that the King had vetoed our laws. Upon an American political theory of 1776 rests the security and the unity of the British Commonwealth of Nations in 1936! The mills of the gods do grind. Men and states do change. Institutions founded upon the rock of truth have a way of persisting. View the League in the light of the evolution of an idea and the golden thread of men's age-old purposes finds expression and promise of fulfillment. Historians are never good interpreters of the present. This quotation from Tacitus in speaking about Rome's burning in Nero's time should make us thoughtful today:

"Neither human aid, nor imperial bounty, nor offerings to the gods, could remove the sinister suspicion that the fire had been started by Nero's orders. So, to get rid of this rumor, Nero shifted the blame onto others; and with the most elaborate tortures he punished those people, whom the mob, hating their abominations, used to call Christians. The source of the name was one Christus, who, in the reign of Tiberius, was punished with death by the procurator Pontius Pilatus. For the moment the detestable superstition was checked; but it began to break out again, not only in Judea, where the mischief began, but also in Rome, where everything hideous and shameful from every quarter gathers and is welcome."

Tacitus, in describing the Christian superstition, uses the imperfect tense, as if it were a matter of the past which educated readers of his day might have forgotten. He emphasizes that Nero's cruelties roused pity for his victims, richly, according to Tacitus, as they deserved their fate. The vulgar are often more sentimental than historians. Tacitus was too close to Rome and its feelings toward a "growing superstition" to see what was happening. Are not the wise of the earth today too interested in the news of the earth to fail to comprehend the force of the new world opinion? It is an old theory for governments and ministers to fall when they run counter to public opinion of their own states. It is a new thing when ministers fall because they run counter to world opinion. But in our day we have seen it happen.

World thought, concerning the conduct of nations to each other, made articulate through a medium existing for the exchange of opinion and the development of a universal public will, is the League's crowning glory. In the attainment of that desired end the League will have the blessings of the thoughtful of the earth.

#### ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES A. FARLEY AT MIAMI, FLA.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered at the Roosevelt dinner, Miami, Fla., on February 5, 1936, by Hon. James A. Farley, chairman of the Democratic National Committee.

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

Mr. Chairman, Governor Sholtz, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, I am having a most enjoyable visit in Florida. It is delightful to be again under the Florida sun and away from the blizzards of less-favored sections, even if my stay is temporary, and I am particularly happy to again meet many old friends, some of whom I have met here upon former visits and some of whom, like myself, come from colder climates to enjoy and benefit from your wonderful climate.

It is cheering to know that Florida is enjoying another wonderful season; that your hotels are doing well; your beaches thickly populated; and that all places of recreation are experiencing a fine season. There is a general atmosphere of success and contentment everywhere. As I note these most satisfying conditions, I recall another season down here. I refer to the winter of 1933 when a very different picture was presented. Many of those I see about me now were not in Miami during that period. There was

not a single hotel in which accommodations were not eagerly extended. Not a few of the winter palaces of our wealthy citizens were untenanted that year. The familiar faces which I note today were conspicuous by their absence. The reason for this was pretty obvious. Business throughout the country was at a low ebb. Most of our large industrial corporations were running along on a deficit, and many of our important financial institutions were also either "in the red" or pretty close to it.

Evidences of better times that are so apparent in Miami and other sections of Florida have a far wider application than your local contentment. Florida, as a national winter recreation center, is the symbol, as well as an index of national economic conditions of the country. A big play season here usually means a prosperous season in the great centers of commerce and industry.

I do not mean to infer that the presence of a large group of millionaires on the Florida beaches tells the whole story, for if it were not that the people of more modest income felt that they could afford to travel thousands of miles and enjoy such a vacation as you give them here, you would not have these crowds of people doing happy spending as a preparation for the strenuous life of the rest of the year. The merchants, manufacturers, and their employees all feel the impulse of better days and the urge as well as the ability to pay for the rest and recreation of a winter sojourn in Florida.

Three years ago the one gleam of sunshine amid the prevailing gloom to the captains of industry and of finance was the anticipation of the advent of a new President. They looked forward to March 4th of that year as the date of the happy release from their afflictions. They had turned thumbs down on the President under whom the country had floundered in economic chaos. They had no plan of their own by which to check the downward trend, to check the ebbing tide of business, to check the ever-rising discontent of that great mass of the population which, through no fault of its own, faced destitution and desperation.

It seems incredible now but 3 years ago the idea of revolution did not seem far-fetched to many of the eminent group of whom I have made mention. Their only hope was in Franklin D. Roosevelt. They did not know how he was going to do it, but they did know that they themselves did not have a process in mind and he represented their only hope.

Now, I wonder how they thought he was going to do the job? Did they think he had a magic wand by which he could put back to work millions of the unemployed? Did they think that he could weave a spell with a few mystical words that would start their mills and factories turning at full speed again? Did they think that all he had to do was to say the word to put money into empty pockets and so restore the purchasing power of professional men, farmers, clerks, and mechanics who could thus buy and pay for their goods and so get the wheels of business revolving again? Did they think that by some magic formula he could still the hungry unrest and put hope into the hearts of a hungry and angry multitude?

Well, he did a good job. You have only to look about you to see that money is again in circulation and that business is flourishing. I will not bore you with statistics but I do wish to give you a few figures which emphasize the point I make.

Recently, *Business Week* printed a list showing how dividends of major industrial groups in 1935 compare with those in 1934. This list follows:

- Banks and insurance up 7 percent.
- Chain stores up 1 percent.
- Copper up 148 percent.
- Foods up 2 percent.
- Department stores up 31 percent.
- Mail-order business up 165 percent.
- Motors up 42 percent.
- Motor equipment up 42 percent.
- Oils up 8 percent.
- Public utilities up 1 percent.
- Railroads up 3 percent.
- Railroad equipment down 40 percent.
- Steels up 100 percent.
- Tobaccos down 3 percent.
- The total was up 10 percent.

Three or four weeks ago the newspapers throughout the country, and particularly in New York, published articles summing up business conditions in the country during 1935 and anticipated further improvement in 1936. One of the metropolitan papers carried a three-column story about the resumption of dividends on preferred and common stocks and of increased dividends, whereas most of these corporations were passing dividends 3 years ago.

Comparing the less than 3 years of the New Deal with the last 3 years of the Old Deal, we find that there has been a reduction in unemployment of 30 percent; an increase in the value of cotton, wheat, and corn of 100 percent or more; an increase in industrial production of 51 percent; and that listed stocks have gone up 130 percent in value, while listed bonds have increased in value 22 percent.

The so-called money class, who 3 years ago were frightened lest their fortunes be engulfed by a repetition in the United States of what had happened in some of the foreign countries, are now so confident and prosperous that they think all peril is past and that no problem confronts them except to make more money. They are so cocky over their relief from the pain of fear that they want to cast aside the new mechanisms which made it possible for the economic machinery to move again.

You are all familiar with the process of mind which makes a few people think they are the whole show. I think that that is what is the matter with some of those who form the backbone of the American Liberty League, or what is often referred to as the American Lobby League. They have, of course, at their command vast sums of money and the ability to purchase propaganda in unlimited amount. They have made so much noise that they have perhaps convinced themselves that the racket of their own raising is a voice of the business community.

I feel obliged to underrate them. They will find when it comes to the showdown next November that for every capitalist or industrialist who wishes to bring back Hoover days there will be 10 of his own economic group who appreciate that the New Deal, of which these eminent persons are so critical, stopped the panic and gave them, each of them, a chance to recover. They know it is absurd to charge the Roosevelt administration with being the enemy of business. Its whole successful effort has been to save and restore business and it has accomplished that very thing, just as it has removed the great mass of our people from the jeopardy of economic destruction.

The so-called Liberty League, composed of representatives of very big business and the very enormous fortunes, corporation lawyers who are being well paid to belong, and others, held a widely heralded dinner in Washington, a few evenings ago, the objective being to attack and undermine the Roosevelt administration and its accomplishments.

In this connection we recall that this American Liberty League recently announced its program for the Congress of the United States, which announcement helped to clarify its purpose and objective in having taken upon itself to organize its own supreme court of "52 distinguished corporation lawyers" and to pass upon the constitutionality of Roosevelt legislation. Under these circumstances it is not amiss for the American Liberty League to assume the functions of the President in sending a message.

Ninety-five percent of Americans may be astonished at the nature of its demands.

It demands the immediate balancing of the Budget, knowing full well that this would mean the abandonment of all those activities for the creation of work and the prevention of starvation to those who have no work.

It does propose "moderate relief appropriations"—which means the abandonment of relief in view of the number who are dependent upon it for food and shelter.

It demands that the public works, which has given employment to 3,500,000 people, who with their dependents number to 10,000,000 people, be abandoned and the 3,500,000 be thrown back on charity.

It naturally demands the repeal of the recent tax measure which increases the taxes of the enormously rich and increases the inheritance taxes.

This loss is to be made up, as pointed out at the meeting of the great industrialists, by denying exemptions for children to the taxpayers and by increasing the taxes of the poor and by adding to the list of income-tax payers those who barely have enough on which to live.

It demands the repeal of the Wagner law, which has been referred to as the Magna Carta of labor and which guarantees collective bargaining and protection to the toiler in his right to organize. It demands the throwing out of the Guffey Act, which tends to end the cutthroat competition of the coal operators, which was driving the coal companies to bankruptcy and reducing the miners to the status of serfs.

And it rushes to the defense of unscrupulous holding companies of the type made notorious by Sam Insull, to the end that a few porch climbers of high finance may continue to enrich themselves by robbing the stockholders.

It proposes to destroy the President's social-security legislation, the most humane, progressive, and decent in our history, by divorcing the people's National Government from any connection with it. This would mean the destruction of the Social Security Act and this is what is intended.

If the party opposing Roosevelt in the coming elections is honest with the people it will incorporate all these demands in its platform. The so-called Liberty League is the center and soul of the predatory powers.

Its program is frankly plutocratic and asks for the rule of money over men as during the 12 years before Roosevelt's administration.

It abhors all governmental activity that offers interference with the selfish will of very powerful selfish groups.

It demands that workers and farmers be "put in their places", and made to understand that they are mere hewers of wood and carriers of water.

It resents taxation of the very rich in accordance with their capacity to pay and believes that the Mellons and the Morgans and the Du Ponts should be relieved by increasing the taxes of the middle class and the poor.

Its idea of the "American way" is to maintain a system under which all the wealth of the Nation was being concentrated in the hands of a very few—5 percent of the people.

It seems no obligation on the part of the Government to adopt the social legislation England has had for many years for the protection of the superannuated people from an old age of beggary and charity.

The Liberty League is the organization of those Bourbons who learn nothing and forget nothing. It will do much to advance socialism and communism. It would rule America. It would squeeze the worker dry in his old age and cast him like an orange rind into the refuse pail. And it would continue the infamous

policy of using the agencies of government to create a plutocracy that would perpetuate the sorry business of the Mellons and the Morgans in reducing 95 percent of the people to the status of serfs at the mercy of the exploiters at the top.

The American Liberty League speaks as conclusively for the reactionaries and their party as does Mr. Hoover, the United States Chamber of Commerce, and the National Manufacturers Association.

Indeed, the league is composed in large part of the representatives of that big business which brought the Nation to the outer rim of ruin.

While the Republican National Committee and its allies, such as the American Liberty League, are denouncing the Roosevelt administration with the charge that it has failed to carry out in full all planks of the Chicago platform, they choose to ignore the fact that notwithstanding the Roosevelt administration went into office facing more acute emergency problems than ever had been faced by any previous administration, it has carried out many of the most important planks of that platform.

Our critics ignore the fact that the Roosevelt administration has passed social-security legislation; that it has provided regulation of investment firms and stock exchanges; that it has prevented the unloading of worthless stocks and other securities on the public; that bank deposits have been guaranteed; that banks have been required to divorce their investment business from their commercial banking business; that the prohibition law has been repealed; that hundreds of thousands of home owners have had their homes saved for them; that thousands upon thousands of farmers have been protected from the foreclosure of mortgages on their farms; that relief has been provided for millions of those who had no work; that farm and commodity prices have been about doubled; that farm and other property values have been increased many billions of dollars.

This does not appear such a bad record after all.

The desperate condition of the country early in 1933 called for emergency treatment, and this has delayed the fulfilling of some of the campaign pledges. However, the percentage of platform pledges carried out has been as great in the Roosevelt administration, if not greater, than in previous administrations.

Regardless of what the spokesmen of the Republican National Committee and of its ally, the American Liberty League, have to say in their criticism and their denunciation of President Roosevelt, the fact remains that there is not a single man in public life today who remotely approaches Franklin D. Roosevelt in a capacity for public service and leadership in these reconstruction days.

First, he has courage, and no one denies that. Whatever he thinks necessary to do, he does, regardless of the power of the forces against him. He is no more impressed by the grumblings from Wall Street than by the clamor of other misguided minority groups. He has Jacksonian courage.

Second, he has vision, and no one has seen so clearly through the system of privilege to its wrongs and fatal weaknesses and no one looks so far into the future in his planning for the betterment of living conditions for all.

Third, he has constructive genius; and while minor mistakes have been made his every plan has rested on the sound foundation of the realities.

Fourth, he has a humanitarian outlook; he knows that government affects men and women and children and must be made to serve their interest if it deserves to live. He has thought of the aged no longer able to work; of thousands of young men who, unable to find work, were roaming aimlessly up and down the highways, facing all kinds of temptation and providing a fertile field for the revolutionary and communistic agitators; of the worker threatened with the loss of his job through no fault of his; of mothers on whose care poor children depend, of crippled children who may be saved for useful service to society. He has a heart.

Fifth, he has tireless energy, and when others have gagged he has remained fresh and eager and pushed on.

Sixth, he retains an open mind, which means that he admits the possibility of occasional misjudgment, and having no concealed pride of authorship he keeps his mind open and receptive both to suggestions and criticisms.

Seventh, he has a passion for public service, and from the moment he entered the Legislature of New York he dedicated himself, his thought and his strength, to the service of society, and his worst enemy does not suggest that there is a stain upon his record.

Eighth, he is honest, and that requires no amplification. No one doubts it.

Ninth, he is passionately attached to the American system of democracy and constitutional liberty. With him this is an instinct. It runs in his blood.

Tenth, he looks upon himself as the servant of the people, and beyond any other President has been frank with them. He requires no advance written questions to be answered at press conferences. He takes his questions off the bat and answers them with a most refreshing frankness. And at intervals he sits down at the microphone and in simple language and in conversational tone he chats with the people in city, hamlet, and on far-off ranches, explaining what he has done and why he has done it. Because of this no other President has ever been as close to the people.

Eleventh, he is no demagogue; he does not rant; he does not stoop to conquer by demagogic appeals.

Twelfth, he has a saving sense of humor, and this keeps him human and his feet upon the ground.

Call the roll of public men and match this combination if you can.

#### JAPAN'S ORIENTAL POLICY

##### THREAT TO THE UNITED STATES AND CHINESE OPEN-DOOR POLICY

MR. PITTMAN. Mr. President, there have been a great number of publications emanating from officers of the Japanese Government touching their policy in the Orient as it affects our own foreign policy. I have very carefully segregated and collated these statements for the purpose of having Congress determine exactly what their policy is and, as nearly as possible, how it will affect us in the future. I have condensed my statement as much as possible, I will say to the Senate, and therefore I will appreciate it if I may read the statement before any questions are asked. If there shall be any questions after that, I shall be very pleased to attempt to answer them.

Mr. President, I think it is high time that Congress take cognizance of the Japanese policy with regard to China, and its intended effect upon the United States. I say "Congress", because in the end Congress alone has the power and the duty imposed upon it to appropriate money for the national defense.

The Japanese Government seems very intense in its desire that we should fully understand their foreign policy and its relation to our Government. Let us, therefore, calmly and judiciously accommodate the Japanese Government and consider their policy as evidenced by their frank and bold pronouncements, and substantiated by their acts.

The Japanese Ambassador to the United States, who never hesitates to advise our people as to the foreign policy of his Government as it affects us, and to justify such policy, in his speech before the Japan Society at New York, on January 31, publicly discussed the Japanese foreign policy with regard to China, and for the evident purpose of silencing our citizens, and possibly our Government, with regard to Japan's Chinese policy, intimated that such policy is the same policy as our Monroe Doctrine. Portions of his speech, and subsequently an interview with regard to the intimation above referred to, were published in the press throughout the country.

I will state that I wrote the Japanese Ambassador and asked him if he was correctly reported in the press, and, in answer to my inquiry, he sent me a copy of the speech he had delivered. I find that he was correctly reported in the press.

Here is what the Japanese Ambassador says with regard to our Monroe Doctrine and with regard to Japan's Chinese policy:

#### AMBASSADOR MISCONSTRUES MONROE DOCTRINE

Up to the time of the World War all of the great nations of the west possessed territory in east Asia which they had taken from the Chinese or other people near to Japan. These occidental aggressions had caused the Japanese to wage several minor and at least one major war. Naturally our people want no repetition of these western encroachments into their sphere of the world. The United States would countenance favorably none in any part of the Americas from Europe or Asia.

The report of the speech then says that the Japanese Ambassador contended that wherever Japanese have gone "they have enormously improved conditions for the interest and welfare of local peoples." He cited specifically benefits to Formosa, Korea, and Manchuria, and implied that Japan could similarly help China.

We have not forgotten the history of the conquest of Korea, and the conquest of Manchuria is fresh in our minds. That last conquest was in violation of the Covenant of the League of Nations, the Kellogg-Briand Pact to outlaw war, and the nine-power pact adopted at Washington in 1922. Japan at the time of such conquest was a party to all of such treaties. We have taken notice of the acts of Japan in North China, looking to the consummation of the Chinese policy. We are aware of the three-point demand made by Japan on China; we are aware that the acceptance by China of such demand is a final surrender of her sovereignty. Yes; we fully understand Japan's policy toward China and toward our Government with relation to China.

I am astonished, however, that the distinguished Ambassador of Japan, who is so learned in history and international law, should attempt to create the impression in our country that Japan's doctrine with relation to China is similar to our Monroe Doctrine. Such doctrines may have similarity as to the threat implied against foreign conquest, but under the Monroe Doctrine we did not arrogate to ourselves the right of conquest or domination in the Americas.

We were seeking to preserve the republics of Latin America, not to destroy them.

There is, however, a Monroe doctrine applicable to China, which Japan, together with eight other governments, including the United States, solemnly agreed to abide by and respect. It is in full force and effect at the present time and has been in full force and effect since 1922. It is known as the Nine-Power Pact. It was adopted at Washington, at the great conference for the elimination of armament and for other purposes, held in the years 1921 and 1922.

#### MONROE DOCTRINE FOR CHINA

Let us see what that doctrine is. I wish the Senate to note carefully this compact. It has been challenged absolutely by Japan and apparently ignored by other members of the compact. I read article I:

The contracting powers, other than China, agree:

- (1) To respect the sovereignty, the independence, and the territorial and administrative integrity of China;
- (2) To provide the fullest and most unembarrassed opportunity to China to develop and maintain for herself an effective and stable government;
- (3) To use their influence for the purpose of effectually establishing and maintaining the principle of equal opportunity for the commerce and industry of all nations throughout the territory of China;
- (4) To refrain from taking advantage of conditions in China in order to seek special rights or privileges which would abridge the rights of subjects or citizens of friendly states, and from countenancing action inimical to the security of such states.

That is the Monroe doctrine for China. I wish now to proceed with further evidence.

Now, let us consider the definite and emphatic pronouncement of an even higher Japanese authority. I say "higher" authority because since 1932 the Government of Japan has been dominated by the officers of the Japanese Army and Navy. Vice Admiral Sankichi Takahashi, commander in chief of all of the Japanese fleets, tells us abruptly how the Japanese policy shall affect the United States. I will read the press report of his statement as published in the Washington Post under date of January 23, 1936. I implore the Senate to listen to this authoritative statement of, I believe, the highest officer in the Japanese Government. I read the article exactly as published:

#### JAPAN'S THREAT

A threat that Japan may extend the cruising radius of her Navy in the Pacific waters if the United States does not alter its commercial and naval policies was voiced tonight by Vice Admiral Sankichi Takahashi, commander of the Japanese fleets.

Speaking before the Osaka Club, Takahashi warned:

I quote his exact language:

"Unless America renounces her naval policy aimed at the expansion and protection of her foreign trade, Japan will be forced to extend the fleets' cruising radius to New Guinea, Celebes, and Borneo, and establish footholds in Formosa and the mandated South Sea Islands."

That is the end of the quotation of his exact language. The press article continues:

The only objective of Japan's naval policy thus far, Takahashi asserted, has been the "national defense", and he suggested that the United States confine her naval program to that purpose.

He commands, in language that cannot be misunderstood, that we abandon our naval policy, refrain from expanding our commerce in China, and cease the protection of our foreign commerce. This command is accompanied with the threat that if we do not yield to his demands Japan will increase its fleet and fortify its islands. Is there any doubt as to the meaning of this threat? We are warned that the admiral intends that we shall be unable to protect our commerce in the west Pacific by reason of the overwhelming Japanese fleet. The admiral should qualify his statement, lest some might be led to believe that it includes our commerce and our relations with the Philippine Islands.

Never in the history of modern times has such an undiplomatic, arrogant, and impudent statement been volunteered by one holding such a position. That statement has been published around the world for over 2 weeks, and yet no explanation or retraction has been heard from representatives of Japan, or any expression of resentment from any source.

Of course, Congress will not be bulldozed into the abandonment of our national defense, the protection of our legitimate foreign trade, or our commerce with China, a friendly nation that is at peace with us and the rest of the world.

#### JAPANESE DECEPTIVE PROPAGANDA

The Japanese propagandists are apparently attempting to influence the good, peace-loving people of this country through deceptive articles and threats of war, with the obvious purpose of having public sentiment restrain the proper action of our Government. As an illustration of this false and destructive propaganda, permit me to call to your attention an article published in the Washington Post of January 19 by Mr. K. K. Kawakami. Mr. Kawakami is a learned and distinguished subject of the Emperor of Japan, and an editorial correspondent of the Tokyo Hoshi Shimbun, one of the largest papers of Japan, and a supporter of the Japanese military government. This article was published at a very opportune time. The women's great peace society of the United States, the committee on the cause and cure for war, was just assembling in Washington. I hold in my hand this article. It occupies practically one whole page. At the top of the page are three large military pictures showing marching soldiers, airplanes in the air, and great battle fleets maneuvering. These pictures clearly indicate the Japanese military power and are calculated to instill in the minds of the pacifists the dominant feeling of fear. That article was published just as this great convention was assembling.

But let me read some of the false and deceptive statements in this article. I quote from Mr. Kawakami's signed article. Listen to this false statement, intended undoubtedly for deception. I read his exact language:

#### FALSEHOOD EXPOSED

At a congenial gathering during the preliminary naval parley held in London a year ago Admiral Standley, so the story goes, gave Admiral Yamamoto a friendly slap on the back and said jokingly, "We will go over to your side and lick you with our present ratio." If the Japanese took the joke seriously it was not because of their proverbial lack of the sense of humor.

Before that good-natured back slapping at London American admirals, including Mr. Standley himself, had declared solemnly and in no uncertain terms that under the present ratio their fighting fleet was powerful enough to cross the Pacific and engage the Japanese Navy in Japanese waters. They agreed that in the event of trouble between Japan and America, the only region where the American Navy expected to confront the Japanese was on the Japanese side of the Pacific. They also agreed that the Japanese Navy, under the present ratio, could not and would not cross the Pacific to face the American Fleet.

That statement, because of its unreasonableness, is false upon its face; but I do not depend solely upon that. At my request our Government cabled that statement to Admiral Standley at London. He cabled his reply upon the same day. Here it is:

I categorically deny statement attributed to me by Kawakami.

That false statement was calculated to influence the peace convention then being assembled, and to urge upon it the adoption of a resolution against further naval construction by the United States. Whether such article had its influence or not the fact remains that that women's great peace society did adopt a resolution opposing the further strengthening of our Navy.

But Mr. Kawakami felt impelled to give some excuse why Japan refused our proposal at the London conference to cut all navies 20 percent, even if his excuse is inconsistent with his former argument. Here is what he said in this article:

At London the American delegation proposed that all navies be reduced by 20 percent. The proposal is superficial and impracticable, if not deceptive. The 25 percent which the American Navy would scrap would consist of obsolete, superfluous ships which it is but too glad to get rid of.

Well, our Government knows that we have many obsolete ships, and so does the Japanese admiral; but how did Kawakami get in on this secret? The reasoning leads to the

obvious conclusion that Japan has a first-class navy and no obsolete ships. Evidently Mr. Kawakami is in the confidence of high Japanese authorities. He shows no fear of contradiction or of reprimand from that source; and that source does not hesitate to reprimand in no uncertain manner. He speaks freely with regard to both our naval and foreign policies. In his article he declares:

THREATENS OPEN-DOOR POLICY

To the Japanese, American naval policy, like Janus, has two faces. On the Atlantic side America is determined to pursue a policy of noninterference, so much so that she is ready to renounce her traditional principle of the freedom of the seas, at a sacrifice of billions of dollars in trade. On the Pacific side she insists upon the open door in China, even at the risk of war with Japan, though this open door, in the economic sense, is not an asset but a liability to America.

Well, the United States does not intend to surrender the freedom of the seas, and recognizes no jurisdiction in any government on the high seas beyond the 3-mile limit in time of peace.

The pending neutrality legislation, moreover, expressly reserves and reaffirms all of our rights under international law even in time of peace. Foreign governments may be warned that any restrictions that the United States may see fit to put upon its citizens in time of war will not constitute any warrant for illegal treatment of our citizens by foreign governments nor deprive our Government of the right to take any action it sees fit, voluntarily, on behalf of its citizens.

But what has Mr. Kawakami or Japan to do with our policy with regard to the freedom of the seas? And, again, what has our policy with regard to neutrality during war got to do with our peacetime trade with peaceful China? There is no question of the freedom of the seas, neutral rights, or contraband of war involved in the relations between the United States and China. China is still an independent sovereign Government, at peace with the world, and desirous of trading with us, and there is nothing in the circumstances that can legally, or long physically, interfere with such trade.

The last sentence in the paragraph just quoted is quite material and interesting. It confirms and clarifies the policy of which the Ambassador and the Japanese admiral spoke. The door of China is to be closed to us, even if war is necessary to accomplish it; this in spite of the fact that Japan, in reply to the mild inquiry of the British Foreign Minister, promised to maintain the open door to Manchuria.

Well, there is no open door in Manchuria—to us! American bankers, importers, and businessmen have been run out of Manchuria and replaced by Japanese. Our educators and missionaries will not long be able to remain. But if the so-called law of necessity, pleaded by every conqueror, justifies the breaking of the solemn promises contained in the treaties to which I have referred, why should Japan worry about breaking a promise to maintain the open door in China?

OBEDIENCE TO TREATIES OR NAVIES

We have a right to worry over the violation of peace treaties. We know that there are only two ways of protecting our peace. One is through respect for and obedience to peace treaties, and the other is through a sufficient Navy and air force. We prefer the former method of maintaining peace. I deeply regret that some of our greatest peace advocates and peace societies, who have given so much to obtaining the execution of these peace treaties, are incomprehensibly silent when they are openly and ruthlessly violated, and their instrumentalities challenged.

Yes; some of these great advocates go even further, and mercilessly attack those who do protest against the violation of such treaties. Unless the moral sentiment of the world can be brought to bear in condemnation of those who violate peace agreements, those agreements will become inoperative, held in contempt by all the world! Then war, and war alone, will be left as the only instrument to settle international controversies.

At the peace conference held in Washington recently on the cause and cure of war, this subject was discussed most ably and frankly by one of our great peace advocates, and one who has lent his voice and services to the adoption of peace treaties. On January 23, Prof. Grover Clark, of the depart-

ment of history and political science of Wellesley College, addressed this great peace society, known as the National Committee on the Cause and Cure of War, on the subject of "The New Dangers of War." I know that the Senate will be interested in hearing read a few quotations from this great speech. In part, he said:

PROFESSOR CLARK DENOUNCES VIOLATION OF PEACE TREATIES

We call ourselves civilized. We have built a civilized and adequate paper structure of peace pledges and machinery. We need no more treaties, no more pledges, no more international agencies, to show that we really are beginning to be civilized in our international relations. All we need is the determination to use the machinery we have set up. We can have the certainty of continuing peace whenever we are ready to pay the price of peace—effective insistence on international justice and respect for international pledges.

In the Far East the danger of war is real today because Japan now is controlled by men who are determined to secure for their country dominance in that part of the world, and because we of the West in effect have told these militarists and all the peoples throughout Asia that we do not take seriously our own peace pledges. By their move in Manchuria in 1931 the Japanese military chieftains created a situation precisely such as our peace machinery was designed to meet. We failed then, and we have continued to fail, to make that machinery work.

The machinery of peace has proven useless, however, not through any internal structural lack. The League Covenant and the nine-power treaty contain provisions entirely adequate for putting an abrupt end to the use of force as an instrument of national policy by the Japanese militarists. The peace machinery did not do that for which it was created simply because we were not sufficiently determined to make it work. The machinery was there. The driving power to make it function was not.

We also have failed in another vital way. We have failed completely to show by our dealings with this military-dominated Japanese Government that our attitude was in any way affected by the fact that that Government flagrantly had broken solemn international pledges to which it and our own Government were parties. We have continued to deal with this brazenly faithless Government precisely as though it had remained completely faithful to the pledges which it had made to and with us. We have sent our Ambassadors to it and received its Ambassadors as though we still felt perfect confidence in its good faith. We have exchanged notes and other communications with it, recalling friendly relations in the past and expressing satisfaction that such relations still continued, as though that Government had done nothing whatever to which we had the slightest objection. And finally—crowning mockery—representatives of the American and British Governments have just spent 2 long months in negotiations looking toward a new treaty with the representatives of this military-dominated Japanese Government, which has proved by its acts that even the most solemn treaty pledges mean nothing to it.

Truly we of the West, by our failure to use the peace machinery when the situation cried out for its use, and by our continued dealing with this Japanese Government as though it were a thoroughly dependable and honorable member of international society, have demonstrated that our desire for peace is of the lips only and our machinery for securing peace is a castle in the clouds of Spain.

Professor Clark performed an invaluable service to this large representative body of women gathered from all over the United States seeking a cure for war. I deeply regret to be compelled to admit that his suggested cure for war—namely, the enforcement of peace treaties—failed to receive official endorsement by the convention.

COMPARISON OF JAPANESE AND AMERICAN NAVIES

I have attempted accurately to give the facts, and fairly to analyze the effect of such policy. It is obvious that it bears directly upon our naval policy. I intend at the proper time to discuss the comparative strength of the navies of Japan and the United States on the Pacific. I may say, however, that it is generally conceded that the United States Navy is not as strong as the Japanese Navy in any operations that might take place in the far Pacific. We have no safe base for supplies and repair west of the Hawaiian Islands. The deterioration of the effective strength of naval vessels attempting to operate 3,000 or 4,000 miles away is too well known to require discussion. I will content myself at present by reading a statement recently made by Admiral Edgar B. Pratt, retired, former Chief of Naval Operations, and an officer who is recognized as one of the greatest naval strategists this country has produced. The statement of Admiral Pratt was published recently, after the statement of Admiral Takahashi, which I have just read. I will not read the entire statement; I will read only a part of it. Admiral Pratt said:

Japan is doing what every country has done which has had motives other than limitation of arms. Her demand for naval

parity means that Japan desires to become excessively strong, for the sum of power is not based on naval limitation alone.

If Japan were to have a navy equal in size and strength to the United States, her common limit of power would be greater than ours; her Army is superior to ours; her air force is equal to ours.

The Japanese ask for more than is just. She is seeking to do what Germany did in the years that led up to the World War. Germany sought the greatest army and the greatest navy. The sum of the power factors gave her a "common upper limit" of arms far in excess of other nations.

Continuing, he said:

So long as we have an adequate navy we are secure from invasion. It is important, therefore, that we keep abreast of every improvement in all branches of naval equipment.

#### DEFENSE SACRIFICES BY UNITED STATES

No government has made more serious efforts toward the limitation of armaments than the United States; apparently, however, up to the present our efforts have accomplished no beneficial results, but have resulted in great and unnecessary sacrifices by our Government.

We cannot forget the great convention held in the United States upon the invitation of our Government in 1921 and 1922 for the limitation of armaments and fortifications. Never was there a stronger appeal made to the conscience and sentiment of the world than was presented by our own delegation upon the opening of that great convention. Our present Chief Justice, as the head of our delegation, boldly and frankly opened the meeting by the proposal that our Government would destroy seven battleships constructed and in the process of construction.

We cannot forget with what acclaim the representatives of other governments in the world approved and accepted this astounding proposition. We destroyed our battleships, and other governments in good faith destroyed their blueprints or obsolete vessels. And, this having been accomplished to our great sacrifice, the convention then refused to limit the construction of cruisers of 10,000 tons and under, submarines, and military airplanes, and the manufacture of poisonous gases.

We did not take advantage of this unlimited power, but other governments did. We did not build up to the limit, but other governments did. And then, to add to the further amusement of the foreign representatives at this great convention, Japan insisted, before even entering this agreement, that the status quo of the insular fortifications in the far Pacific north of Singapore should be maintained.

Well, whom did that hit? It did not strike at Great Britain's plans of fortification at Singapore, its great naval base; it did not touch deeply the Japanese plan of fortification, because that Government, prior to that time, had been feverishly fortifying various of its islands.

By every obligation imposed upon a government it is our duty, in honor and in good conscience, to defend and protect our citizens and those dependent upon us for protection, not only in the far Pacific but wherever they may be. Apparently this cannot be accomplished through treaties, and if that be so, then there is only one answer, and that is dominating naval and air forces.

It is my purpose to continue to give my support to the maintenance of respect for and obedience to peace treaties and the enactment of legislation that will tend to keep us out of war without the surrender of any of our international rights, but until the time arrives when there is universal respect for and obedience to peace treaties I favor and will support the construction and maintenance by the United States of naval and air forces that will be sufficient to protect our citizens, those dependent upon us, and their legal rights.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, I rise to address the Senate in acknowledgment of an indebtedness to the able chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Senator from Nevada [MR. PITTMAN], for calling to the attention of this body a state of facts too much ignored by both the Congress and the people. I had not intended in any wise to address this honorable body upon this subject, or this day on any subject, but the address of the able Senator revived to my mind how I had boldly asserted in the Senate but a short

while past, in support of the naval bill then before us, that there would arise as menacing the United States from the Pacific coast a situation because of which, did we not now take heed of it in the calm moments when reflection could occupy her office, we would find ourselves, at some serious moment, in a condition when excitement so exaggerated our emotions as to avoid a just measure of judgment. From such inflamed state danger to our people surely would follow.

Mr. President, I then boldly proclaimed that the time had come when it was evident to me that the policy of Japan was to take charge of all Asia, her policy being upon the theory that she would announce as in emulation of that of the United States to the South American Continent known as the Monroe Doctrine. I said that Japan would go further in the process of her undertaking by announcing the theory of Asia for the Asiatics. Her next step would be the gradual elimination, by such force as she would be able to command, of all the interests of Americans and all the people of America in the Orient. In this departure she would seek to justify herself before the world on the ground that the United States, under our exclusion law, having forbade her people citizenship in this country and limited the number who could be residents, she has the right to exclude Americans from Japan and from the soil of Asia when she is powerful enough to enforce it.

Mr. President, I see another feature which the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations possibly avoided, or possibly he has not viewed it as I do. Mr. President, I assert that the United States has not yet become acquainted with either Japan or Russia and their possibilities adverse to the United States. Sir, just before the United States, just ahead of it, is a serious antagonistic approach. It is that Japan will soon move toward Russia or surely Germany with a proposition that Russia or Germany, leading out by the way of Siberia, though now a competitor, may become a partner, if you please, in the enjoyment of all of Asia, and shall have the control of all of Asia and lands to the east.

As the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee has ably pointed out Japan as having a great navy, I add to this the fact: There is Russia with a great army. As I saw the display while lately in Russia—Russia presents now the largest fleet of airplanes there is in all the world, and to this the largest standing army in numbers on earth. As the finality of this situation the result will be clearly that instead of fighting out the quarrels of the day over Manchuria between Russia and Japan—an alliance between these two will be made with the understanding that Russia is to furnish the army from the north, Japan to furnish the navy. These two in combination will assert and maintain the supremacy of the whole zone from Russia in the main to the end of Siberia. This will involve China and Japan, Korea, and the Philippines. Including them all the two nations will have complete control and direction particularly as against the United States of America.

I beseech my eminent colleagues who have favored me with their attention since I rose to follow the intimations made by the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee; to dwell on the fact that our United States are only 18 miles from Russia. From Pacific edge of Russia to the western extremity of that part of our country called Alaska it is but 1 hour's ride in the ordinary flying machine; it is not half a day's journey by the ordinary naval vessel. Our country seems not to think of the situation. Sirs, if the time should come that this Nation shall be so lax in the strengthening of its Navy and the due preparation of its defense as to allow the countries whose object it is to drive us out of all competition, commercial and industrial, in the whole sphere of Asia; we would be the victim of the proposed combination and result I describe. Hear me, Senators! at the expense of having in length or extreme of assertion risked the loss of your good opinion.

I here announce that without a complete and sufficient Navy the seizure of our Territory would first be made of Alaska, when the assailant would say to the United States, "Gentlemen, come and get it"; and we should then be com-

elled from the long, long distance to get our Navy from some source, as in another instance such as occurred in the Spanish-American War, when we had to make a great circle and circuit, going around the Horn, to be ready for the protection of the interests of this our country.

Then we next would find Japan seizing the Philippines and saying to us, "If you have any interests here, gentlemen, come and protect them." Between the Philippines on the one side possessed by Japan, Alaska right by the doorway, at the foot of Russia, possessed by Russia and her forces; with these two nations in combination, pray, will our country not do well now to consider what is the likelihood tomorrow of the consummation of such an event?

Mr. President, I do not wish to take issue with my brethren as to the measures they have proceeded with and, perchance, closed with respect to the Philippines; but for myself, sirs, I regard it as a great blunder on the part of the United States if it shall wholly give up, at this particular time, control of the Philippine Islands.

The eminent chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee has just alluded to the existence of the Navy, and in his address has spoken of the absence of proper bases for the Navy, the lack of which would so separate our Navy to different parts of the seas that to gather itself together to defend our country would be in itself almost an impossible task.

Yet, in face of this fact, this, our Government, out of a specious, and, in my judgment, a mistaken generosity and form of zeal, indulging a Utopian theory under which one thinks of every country but one's own, is now on the eve of abandoning the only real base that America rightfully had as a legitimate ground of concentration for the Navy in order to guard and to prepare against the conditions I suggest and describe; and the existence is proven, sirs, by the events around us and of which established history now recorded affords complete confirmation.

Mr. President, this brings me to the conclusion to which I wish to direct the attention of my able colleagues. I ask, what is the meaning of these institutions throughout our country which have among their number eminent professors of colleges, splendid and noble-minded women, impulsive, and, I know, wholly patriotic men, assembling throughout the land to condemn the Congress for voting appropriations for the support of the Navy? Here we have the accusation that by making modern the Navy and supporting it by fitting guardianship we are inviting conflict. Goody women, inspired by some sources of wrong guidance, have put the query to us, "Do you expect to drive our sons to war?" They overlook, I fear—not having had time to contemplate the situation—that the only defense of their sons to protect them from going to war is a complete and sufficient Navy. Sirs, the greatest assault that will come on this country is not from within. We are able to guard ourselves against the feared dangers to our country at home. The National Guards of our respective States, sirs, may in emergencies at our doors be called upon in their several spheres for our country's protection. The country may command them if need be. The same thing is true with respect to the police forces of our cities in any eventualities that could explode of local disturbance.

Mr. President, our national danger does not come from sources from within; our peril lies in assault from abroad. But, sirs, with a Navy complete, watching and guarding our shores, we shall be able to see that none shall intrude upon us; that they are not allowed to trespass upon or become possessed of our soil by investing the shores of this our country. That truth, sirs, makes it unnecessary to accumulate great armies within the interior. In that result we protect the sons of the mothers from being drafted and drawn and enlisted into armies. We can, by means of our Navy, avoid the prospect of the country being assailed by a foreign foe to the extent necessary to call upon our whole force of national defense to rally themselves in the form of protection for America.

Then, Mr. President, I ask the question—and it is for that purpose I rose to supplement the remarks of the able chair-

man of the Foreign Relations Committee: How can America anticipate the things referred to by the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee and that which I depict, or how shall our country prepare its defense, if there shall be all around us a spirit that condemns the United States in its effort to prepare for its defense and safeguard America?

We seek no war upon Japan. We seek no war upon any land. We are prepared to do that which the ordinary judgment of mankind approves—to prepare to defend ourselves against a war that is intended against us. It may not be for today; it may not be for tomorrow; but the war we prepare against is a form of war that is to be carried on at once for the purpose of reducing us, in all matters of commercial and industrial competition, to a point where we shall be impotent as against these who are our rivals. This to prevail—even though martial conflict against us becomes necessary to achieve the object.

Mr. President, it is because of that that I summon my colleagues to contemplate whether we should not ask these peace organizations, with their great resources, if they do not realize that in their desire that we should abandon every effort of strengthening the Navy and adding to the defense of our land, by that very course we invite assault upon us? I dare say to this honorable body, we never would have been in war with Germany had this country been in such a condition that the German masters of military maneuvers could have seen that their country would have been defeated in its submarine venture had it dared assault us. We never would have gone to war in the mere matter of conflict of France and England with Germany as to the rivalry of economic advantages, commercial monopoly, and territorial aggression, one over the other. Sirs, in that dread day our country would have been wise enough to see the danger arising from the propaganda coming from those seeking to drive us to war. War on our part did not, as is now charged in select sources, come because of President Wilson, nor was it originated by the United States Army. It was instituted by those standing at a distance of superiority, arrogating to themselves that they were purer and nobler in patriotism than the rest of mankind, and charging that all who opposed war lacked true patriotism. These, through their propaganda, characterized the citizens who disagreed with them as wanting in loyalty or respectability. It was they who brought on the war by their demonstration; they now deplore yet condemn the United States for yielding to the propaganda they propagated.

Do my colleagues think if these propagandists were powerful in one instance they would not be equally so in another? And yet note the activity now presented by this group! Let us be frank with ourselves. Do my colleagues in this body fancy that these who discourage the country in its defense may not be stimulated as before by the same propaganda from abroad? And this with purpose to weaken us at home?

Through the cry of the necessity for peace at any price they enable our rivals, whoever they are—our opponents, from wherever they may come—to behold at the proper time the weakness of our Government, the lack of defense and support, and in such an hour to strike. From this phase of danger and destruction we must awake to that fact of peril and realize the duty to overcome it.

Mr. President, I would that my honorable colleagues in this body and those in the other body of the Congress should begin to consider the threats by conduct directed to this country, and to know what will be our fate if we fail to advise caution and give consideration to our real situation. Therefore, Mr. President, indulging as I have already too far the generosity of this body in listening to me, I propose that we begin to inform our fellow citizens of the societies which organize opposition against America's national defense of the evils they are bringing on themselves. Let them see the situation of the world as it confronts us; and let them behold the plain tragic truth, Mr. President—that this, our great America, has not one real friend among the nations of the world. Neither appreciation for our aid, nor gratitude for our sacrifices, has moved those to whom in the World

War conflict we gave so much. They will not even, in this hour, recognize the debts growing out of the money they drew from our Treasury. They do not appreciate the sustenance we gave them financially, nor have they gratitude for the sacrifices of our children on the battlefield to fall in death for them. These nations do not acknowledge their debt to us, and far less do they contribute a dollar toward its repayment, as they scoff and smirk at our demand for payment.

Yet, with a spirit of that nature and with the account as given us today by the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, we and our country realize that it has in hazard and peril nowhere to go but to itself. In all tribulation it must depend solely on itself. Sirs, the situation must be perfectly apparent to a reflective mind. In the face of this, are we to sit idle and flatter ourselves that all the world is craving to embrace us to its bosom in fraternity under the specious name of world peace? Let there be no further delusion; let us realize that peace with us lies in our being able to compel it, and that the real defense of this country lies in its ability to show before the whole world that we contemplate no quarrel with any people, but that if there be any who contemplate a quarrel with us we are ready to resist the advance, and that this Nation still stands, as it ever must, as Americans in America for America and for the honor of this the United States of America. I thank the Senate. [Applause in the galleries.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GEORGE in the chair).—Visitors in the gallery will preserve order.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from Nevada as to the speech of Professor Clark from which he quoted, and which I have never read. In his speech Professor Clark repeats that the machinery was at hand to enforce the peace treaties but that we did not use the machinery. What does he mean by that?

Mr. PITTMAN. I would have to give my own construction of it, of course. His subject, as I said before, was The New Dangers of War, and he took as one of the "new dangers of war" the attitude of the Japanese in China. He referred, of course, to the three treaties, the Kellogg-Briand treaty, the Covenant of the League of Nations, and the nine power pact.

In regard to the nine-power pact, he called attention to the fact that the United States was a party to that pact. I take it he means that the threat of a new war about which he was talking possibly could be stopped by proper representations made to the Japanese Government by the parties to the nine-power pact.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, when gentlemen constantly speak of "the machinery" being at hand to enforce the peace treaties at a time when it is contended that the other parties to the treaties were disregarding them, I do not understand what they mean unless they have in mind the use of force. They were disregarding the treaties, it is claimed, and yet we are told by Professor Clark that "the machinery" was at hand to enforce them. There was no "machinery" at hand to enforce the treaties.

Mr. PITTMAN. I believe that the nine-power pact provides for a conference of the nine powers.

Mr. BORAH. Yes; that pact provides for a conference in contemplation of trouble arising; but here was an instance in which the nine-power pact had been disregarded and the time for a conference was here.

Mr. PITTMAN. There is no doubt in my mind, the Senator will understand, that peace treaties are a snare and a delusion unless obedience to them is enforced. I have said before that I do not think it is always necessary to use the Navy to enforce them or to use other forms of physical force. I think that there are other repressive methods that sometimes succeed and sometimes do not succeed.

Mr. BORAH. What I was undertaking to convey to the able Senator was the fact that, in the last analysis, when they talk about enforcing the peace treaties they mean to use force, because that is the only way. You may discuss situations, you may interchange views, but when you talk about enforcing peace treaties you must mean the use of force; and yet you are advocates of peace.

Mr. PITTMAN. I thoroughly agree with the Senator that those who want peace through treaties will have to enforce the treaties or they will not get peace.

#### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER, as in executive session, laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

#### DEATH OF FORMER VICE PRESIDENT CURTIS

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, since the Senate was last in session there has departed this life a former Member of this body, who was also Vice President of the United States. His death occurred on Saturday the 8th instant. Former Vice President Curtis served in the House of Representatives for 14 years; he served in this body for a prolonged period, and throughout 4 years was our Presiding Officer. His career was, in many respects, unusual and remarkable. I do not intend now to speak at length with reference to his character and his public services. I yield to the Senator from Kansas [Mr. McGILL].

Mr. McGILL. Mr. President, on Saturday morning the people of the country were shocked at the news of the death of former Vice President Curtis, who was a citizen of the State of Kansas. Charles Curtis, to my mind, was the most distinguished of Kansans. He rose from an humble parentage and birth to the second position of importance in the Nation.

He first came to the Congress as a Member of the House of Representatives in 1893. He served seven different terms as a Member of that body and served for a long period of time as a Member of the Senate of the United States from Kansas, and then 4 years as Vice President of the United States. With the exception of about 2 years, he served 40 years as a public servant.

I do not propose at this time to make further remarks, but on some future occasion I shall ask the time of the Senate to review the career of former Vice President Curtis. At this time I send forward a resolution, which I ask to have read and considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the resolution.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 233), as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. Charles Curtis, a former Member of this body from the State of Kansas and a former Vice President of the United States and President of the Senate.

*Resolved*, That as a mark of respect to the memory of this distinguished man, whose long life was filled with useful service to the Nation, to his State, and to his fellow men, the Senate do now take a recess until 12 o'clock noon Tuesday.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I join with the able Senator from Arkansas and the distinguished Senator from Kansas in asking for the immediate consideration of the resolution. When I came to the Senate in the early summer of 1917 Charlie Curtis, a Senator from Kansas, was then "whip." Later he became the very distinguished leader of the majority side, and finally he ably and nobly served the country in the office of Vice President.

His was a disposition that called for and inspired affection, and I am pleased to say that every Member of this body who served with him during his long period of service saw fit, on account of his friendly feeling for the former Vice President, to call him by the name of "Charlie." His kindly, generous, tolerant nature endeared him to us all. I sincerely hope that the Senate may now recess out of respect to his memory and his great achievements of public service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution submitted by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. McGILL].

The resolution was unanimously agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.), under the second branch of the resolution, the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 11, 1936, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## NOMINATIONS

*Executive nominations received by the Senate February 10 (legislative day of Jan. 16), 1936*

## FEDERAL ALCOHOL ADMINISTRATION

Capt. Wilford S. Alexander, of Meriden, Conn., to be Administrator of the Federal Alcohol Administration, to fill an existing vacancy.

## NATIONAL EMERGENCY COUNCIL

Donald Renshaw, of California, to be State director, National Emergency Council, for California, vice Jerome F. Sears, resigned.

## PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

Passed Assistant Dental Surgeon William C. Parker to be dental surgeon in the United States Public Health Service, to rank as such from February 11, 1936.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 10, 1936

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Almighty and everlasting God, at the beginning of another day we most humbly praise Thee for the divinity which Thou hast implanted in us; it binds us forever to the Father's heart.

In the night of death, Hope sees a star, and, listening, Love catches the rustle of the wings. Augment the thought in us, O God, that he most lives who thinks most, feels noblest, and acts best.

Gracious Lord, a most distinguished son of the Republic has passed to the larger life, leaving a void in the hearts of those who knew him best. Through many years he proved himself worthy by his public service and by his nobility of soul.

For we know that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens.

O blessed undying truth, which bridges the gulf and makes the continuity of life a glorious reality. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, February 7, 1936, was read and approved.

## WITHDRAWAL OF A BILL

Mr. EKWALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw from the files of the House the bill H. R. 9032, introduced by me sometime ago.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

## WAR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1937

Mr. PARKS, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 11035, Rept. No. 1979) making appropriations for the military and nonmilitary activities of the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937, and for other purposes, which was read a first and second time, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered printed.

Mr. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order.

## HOW CAN WE AVOID WAR?

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address I delivered last night in New York City.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Speaker, by permission of the House, I am offering for printing, as part of my remarks, the full text of an address that I prepared to deliver at a meeting in the Mecca Temple in New York City, held last night, February 9, under the auspices of the New Masses Forum. Due to the fact that my time was limited to 35 minutes, I was unable to deliver all of this address, but for the information

of those who may be interested to know what my views are upon the question of "How can we avoid war?", I am offering these remarks. On the evening of January 23, 1936, I delivered an extemporaneous address before an audience assembled in the auditorium of the Y. M. C. A. Building of the city of Washington, at the invitation of a group conducting a series of lectures on public questions. Upon numerous other occasions during the fall of 1935 and upon several occasions during the month of January of this year, I delivered addresses or brief talks at different places upon the same general theme.

Mr. Speaker, as a lover of peace, I am firmly persuaded after many years of study and reflection and of observation in European countries, and with some little experience in life, that safe and sane, adequate, and reasonable preparedness for defense is one of the several important factors in preserving peace to America. Of course, the conduct of our foreign relations in the proper spirit is vital, also the avoidance of partiality as between nations, and especially as between belligerents, thereby observing a practical, reasonable policy of neutrality, an attitude of fairness, toleration, and justice on the part of all our people toward the peoples of other nations, and other factors that I do not have time to enumerate, must all cooperate harmoniously with a program of national defense in order to preserve our peace.

It is true, Mr. Speaker, that many people think that preparedness implies getting ready to begin aggressive warfare. They ask, "If you do not propose to fight, why prepare to fight?" It is true that our appropriations for preparedness upon land, sea, and in air are very large and have grown enormously in the last 20 years. But our preparedness cannot fairly be measured with that of other nations in terms of dollars. Our standards of living are very high, our pay to soldiers and sailors is much higher than in other countries, our war materials, munitions, arms, and instrumentalities of war are all very much more costly than in other countries. Therefore, the true basis for comparison is number of men and volume of munitions and quantities of supplies, arms, and instrumentalities of war.

Measured upon that basis, America is perhaps almost equal to Great Britain upon the sea, but in the army America ranks fifteenth or sixteenth in actual organized and trained military forces. Of course, there is a reason for this also, and the reason is obvious. But to say that America need not make adequate and proper preparation against the possibility of war being forced upon her simply because we cannot now, and dare not if we could, state what nation, or combination of nations, we think might eventually attack us and attempt to invade us, is unreasonable. Of course, if we know what nation will attack, surely everybody will agree that we should make feverish preparations for defense. But it would probably be too late for us to make adequate preparation, after we learn who are about to attack us. It is something like fire insurance. A man may own several houses and hesitate to insure them because he would not know which one would get burned and when it would get burned. Yet the man who would fail to take out insurance because he did not know when a house would get burned, and which house would get burned, could certainly not be considered a prudent man and many would probably consider him a foolish man. Merely because we do not know when the fire will break out, nor where it will break out, is the very reason we must take out insurance. After we learn when the fire breaks out is absolutely too late to take out insurance. So it is with regard to military preparedness. To be perfectly frank, we all know that America is not very popular now with any of her powerful sister nations in the Old World.

Fortunately, we have the confidence and friendship of our sister Republics in North and South America. But the fact that many nations owe us great sums of money, that we have grown strong and rich very suddenly while many of them have grown poorer, and the fact that we have vast stretches of open country for expansion of our population while many other countries are overcrowded and seeking room for their people, the fact that our industrialists and inventors and

enterprising merchants are taking many of the markets from some old countries, the fact that our financiers have made investments in many countries to both other countries and other nations, and many other facts all combine and concur to induce a feeling of jealousy, envy, and resentment toward America. In such a state of feeling, some mere incident, or some accident, some happening that has no direct relation toward war may precipitate in some other country or countries such agitation and turmoil of feeling as to lead to an outbreak of hostilities against America. We must be realists and read history with open eyes. Idealists may say that they cannot conceive of any reason why any nation should make war upon us. If these idealists, these dreamers, will thoughtfully study the history of most of the wars that have occurred in this country and other countries, they will be able to say of the people of that day and generation that there was no adequate, sufficient, and just reason for commencing a war that entailed so much suffering, destruction, and demoralization. Yet in spite of these facts the wars took place.

I am no optimist and no alarmist, but I know that human nature could not have changed within the last generation or two, and I believe that my father and grandfather and uncles and cousins and ancestors back for generations were just as good, if not better, than I am, and yet they wholeheartedly and patriotically engaged in warfare when it came to the Nation. They were typical of the men of their generations. In spite of good intentions, in spite of Christian civilization, in spite of our detached geographical position, in spite of our being relatively weak, and in spite of our relatively small commerce and few international contacts, we nevertheless got into war. How, therefore, can this generation say that a situation will not arise, and may not arise even in a few years, whereby our Nation will be forced into war? All sane and responsible public men from the beginning of our Republic to the present time, without a single exception, have advocated and supported an adequate defense program. What is adequate is the question that can be answered only in the light of surrounding circumstances, including military activities of other nations and of our international relations and measured by these standards, I believe that America now has a mere minimum of preparedness and that her defense measures for protection against attack by air ought to be greatly increased and enlarged.

Mr. Speaker, I herewith submit the text of the address above referred to:

How can we avoid war?

1. While a positive and satisfactory answer cannot be given at this stage of the world's development, millions of the best minds of the world are constantly working upon the solution of this problem of averting war, and we can only sketch some of the principal considerations that should constantly engage the thought and attention of American citizens seeking to avoid the coming of war to America. The problem is both world-wide and local as applied to each separate nation. Naturally and necessarily each nation must approach the solution of this and all other problems from a selfish point of view. That is the law of nature, which was ordained by God. If each nation can separately solve this great problem and all other problems satisfactorily for itself, then step by step the problems will be solved on a world-wide basis.

The first duty of American citizens is to America; and if this leading nation of the western world and one of the leading nations of the whole world—leading in power and influence and humanitarian interests—can avert war as to America, it will be an example to other nations and will help to localize any war that may occur elsewhere and may ultimately be largely influential in eliminating the cancer and curse of war throughout the world, just as American influence since 1776 has been very powerful in wiping out the autocratic hair-trigger monarchies of other nations, and in substituting for them representative government responsible to the will of the people of the several nations.

2. Agitation against war as such, however militant and aggressive that agitation may be, will accomplish little, if anything, toward the ultimate elimination of war as a means of settling or of unsettling, as a means of composing, or as a means of multiplying differences, rivalries, competitions, and jealousies between different nations; the attack must be against the causes of war. It would be foolish for any public-health service to carry on propaganda against typhoid fever. The propaganda must be directed against the insanitary, the unclean, and the infected areas, conditions and places where the germs of typhoid breed and from which they spread. So in the case of war, we must seek deep for the cause and if we can ever eliminate the cause, we will

accomplish the cure. Therefore, what are some of the causes of war? While they are numerous and occur with varying degrees of causative influences at different times and at different places, yet they may be generalized under the following heads:

- (a) National, racial, religious, rivalries, jealousies, and envy.
- (b) Commercial rivalries and competitions.
- (c) Industrial competitions, causing unemployment, dislocation of populations, and thus human misery and distress.
- (d) Mutual distrust based upon ignorance of each other, thus creating fear; and fear breeds armaments.
- (e) National greed for power and territorial expansion, being but the expression in a collective way of the individual and personal greed and ambition of individual citizens.

(f) Vaulting ambition of individual autocrats, formerly represented by rulers, kings, emperors, kaisers, and czars, and, in these very modern times, by dictators under different names, but seeking to exploit personal success and glory at the expense of the people's sacrifice and suffering, because the governments have been allowed to consolidate all powers in the hands of single persons, rather than having the power distributed among numerous representatives of the sovereign people who ultimately must do the fighting, the paying, and the suffering in the event of war.

#### PROPOSED NEUTRALITY

The American public is just now worked up on the subject of neutrality. Many believe that the right kind of neutrality policy will enable us to avoid being drawn into any general European war. Too often words acquire in the popular mind a value that they do not possess upon close analysis. Popular ideas concerning neutrality may be classed under four general heads with all sorts of variations and modifications, according to the individual notions of each person.

1. The neutrality of George Washington simply meant that America would not take the part of either belligerent, but would trade with either, and with the world at large when opportunity presented, and this policy made it necessary for America to insist upon the freedom of the seas, except where any nation might set up an effective blockade. This has continued to be the policy of America until the passage of the Neutrality Act in the summer of 1935, which act expires on February 28, 1936. The principal feature of this doctrine is the freedom of the seas, for which in part America entered the war in 1917 to maintain and vindicate.

Manifestly, such a theory implies that whenever Americans travel in American ships, and whenever American goods are carried in American ships, it is the duty of the American Government to protect them. Such a policy will necessarily sooner or later involve us in war.

2. The next general group of ideas as to neutrality insists that America should not sell any arms, munitions, or instruments of war, or any other material capable of being converted into instruments of war to either belligerent, nor permit any American firm to finance either belligerent, but that commerce should flow freely to all nations not at war, unless it appears that goods shipped to any government are intended by the consignee for transhipment to either of the belligerents. This policy is enthusiastically supported and bitterly condemned by various sections of American opinion.

3. Still another program of neutrality proposed for America is to keep American citizens and American ships at home, unless they be permitted to travel at their own risk; but that American ports be kept open, and that any foreign ship, either of a belligerent or of a nonbelligerent, be permitted to enter and to load with American goods purchased on the docks and paid for before loading, so that from the moment the outgoing ship crosses the 3-mile limit the goods will no longer be entitled to any American protection, and no one can claim that America is partial to any one belligerent. This policy will permit a partial flow of international trade, but will virtually paralyze for the time being American shipping.

4. A fourth and last proposition of many ardent individuals is the policy of virtual isolation during war between other and major nations having substantial fleets capable of protecting their own carriers upon the seas. This means that not only would American shipping be paralyzed for the period of the war, but American exports would cease, and the prices for those American products that find a substantial market in foreign countries would undoubtedly decline very seriously if a general war should continue for 3 or 4 months, and if the policy of complete isolation was enforced. In this event cotton would probably drop to 4 or 5 cents a pound, and wheat might drop to 40 or 50 cents a bushel. Other products would probably drop in proportion, and the result would be a complete stagnation of American business. While many Americans would say that American farmers and American businessmen would gladly support such losses and sacrifices rather than the greater loss and sacrifice of war, yet I am disposed to doubt if the American public, including farmers, laborers, railway employees, and businessmen generally, with their various clerical forces, would long submit to any such policy. Truly it might be better from a financial point of view to do that, but knowing how people feel in such circumstances; how they become aroused by reason of their own sufferings; how they insist upon their rights of world trade, I apprehend that before many months they would begin a hue and cry for breaking through this embargo, and enforcing our rights to send commerce upon the high seas, and before many months public sentiment would demand that the policy be abandoned, and that American goods and American citizens be permitted to travel and do business in the markets of the world, thus raising prices and relieving unemployment.

## OTHER PEACE-PROMOTING PLANS

Some of the various expedients proposed for reducing the probability of war, because all admit that the possibility of war cannot be eliminated, are a popular vote or referendum before any war can be instituted, except to prevent invasion. Another is to join the League of Nations, and enter into the World Court, and combine with the other nations of the world in maintaining the status quo as to frontiers, populations, existing institutions, etc. Another is complete disarmament among all nations, thus drawing the teeth of the dogs of war and virtually making war impossible. While there is much to be said in favor of the referendum and a concert among all the civilized nations of the world, yet complete disarmament is a dream so insubstantial as to render discussion thereof a waste of time. Even if any one nation should be itself willing to disarm, the fact that other nations would certainly not disarm would prevent any single nation from rendering herself thus defenseless and helpless.

A practical proposal that has been sponsored by the American Legion since the end of the World War is universal mobilization of manpower and resources, and stopping profiteering in time of war, either upon the Government or upon the civilian population, and thus tending to equalize the burdens of war and to remove any temptation to incite war for the purpose of profiteering. This proposal is undoubtedly feasible, practical, in the right direction, and we trust will in a few short months be upon the statute books of the United States. The bill has passed the House of Representatives and is pending before the Senate Committee on Military Affairs, and legislation at this session of Congress is highly desirable. This plan proposes a program of "pay as you fight", so that while the soldiers are striving on land, on water, and in air to defend the Nation and the Nation's rights, that part of the population not in the Army will not be permitted to enjoy profits arising from the existence of war. Heavy taxation will be laid upon incomes and heavy excise duties imposed so that the revenues currently derived from business and industry will be sufficient to pay the costs of munitions and arms, and instrumentalities of warfare, and also to pay the soldiers and to provide for their support and maintenance during the war. According to this plan when the war is over there would be no war debts to be discharged. According to this plan there would be no inflation during the war arising from a program of financing the war by the issuance and sale of bonds, which usually are taken over by the banks and upon these bonds currency issued or credit extended, thus vastly inflating the credit structure and the volume of the paying medium, whether by checks or paper money or coin.

All people interested in justice and fairness should join in a popular demand that this legislation be speedily enacted. In this connection I insist that due recognition shall be given to the efforts and influence of Bernard M. Baruch, of New York City, for his unselfish and patriotic campaign ever since the World War to see that some law shall be passed calculated to prevent profiteering in the event of a future war. Mr. Baruch was chairman of the War Industries Board during the World War, and rendered a most magnificent service to not only this Nation but to our Allies. While in that position he learned just how the practice of profiteering is carried on, and therefore he learned how it might be prevented by proper legislation. Mr. Baruch was under no special obligation to tell the country all that he had learned along this line. Certainly, Mr. Baruch was not under any obligation to carry on at much expense and at great inconvenience his campaign by public speeches, by pamphlets, by magazine articles, by radio addresses, and by newspaper interviews to keep the interest of the public alive in this great plan of preparedness. The latest thing along this line that I have seen from Mr. Baruch appears in the January 1936 number of the American Legion Monthly under the caption "We Won't Have to Fight It." Of course, it means that by proper preparedness along economic, commercial, industrial, and military lines we may avoid war.

If any nation knows that America is prepared by a definite plan, already put upon the statute books, to conduct a war by drawing upon all the resources of the Nation, by meeting the obligations of that war during the war itself, by inspiring cooperation, mutual confidence, and a splendid zeal for a just cause, then any other nation that might otherwise be tempted to invade us, or to violate our rights, and to provoke us to resentment, would be careful not to do so. No nation would recklessly rush into a war and invite almost certain defeat. Due to our geographical situation, if we are adequately prepared not only in arms but in a plan of industrial mobilization, then any other nation would realize the futility of attacking us or of provoking us to war. Thus would peace be assured. Since it takes two parties to make a fight, if we as a peace-loving Nation do not begin any war of aggression against another nation, and if other nations either from the same motives, or from fear of our great power and from a realization of the impossibility of defeating us, would not commence war against us, then our peace would be assured.

## OCEANS NO LONGER BARRIERS OF DEFENSE

America is fortunate in her geographical situation which determines her strategy. With an ocean on each side, and with friendly republics occupying both the North and South American Continents, to whom we have always played the part of big brother, we contemplate nothing but a defensive position to maintain our own peace and to prevent interference with the republican institutions of our sister republics, an obligation we assumed in 1823 under the Monroe Doctrine. With the exception of the War of 1812, which was a mere distant repercussion of the Napoleonic wars, and with the further exception of the War with

Spain in 1898, which was but a logical development of the Monroe Doctrine, we have had nearly 150 years of peace with European powers, with the exception of our war against the German Empire. But what of the future? Multiplied speed by steamships, rapid communication by telegraph, telephone, and radio, with aircraft capable of spanning the Atlantic Ocean in about 15 hours, America's happy isolation from Europe and her tumults is about to cease. With our expanded commerce, with our vast financial interests in European countries, nothing European can long remain a matter of indifference to us. All these numerous points of contact increase our chances for collision with the interests and finally the forces of the larger nations of Europe. In view of this changed position, nations though separated by oceans, now have almost a common frontier, and cities and industrial areas even located far inland from our coasts are now upon the front line and are subject to attack from the air by a hostile air fleet. This spells but one conclusion for America, and that is to have an air force at least equal in numerical strength and more efficient if possible in personnel and in machine performance than that of any other nation.

The only defense against air attack is air defense. According to all human probability, based upon the experience of history, America may have to face a combination of two or more powerful fighting nations. In order to reach us they will be drawn far from their base but nevertheless, they can accomplish great destruction of life and of property, and it remains for us to be prepared to beat down any such hostile air fleet. No longer are mere seaport towns and cities alone interested in problems of defense. Every city and industrial center, however far located from salt water and a land frontier is a possible objective of air attack. This makes the whole Nation vitally concerned with the problems of defense. Fighting is no longer a matter for the soldiers in the air or upon the ground or the sailors on the sea. War becomes a paramount peril and indescribable hazard to the whole civilian population, and every man, woman, and child, of every age, business, station in life, or calling, is vitally concerned with two persistent problems. These are, first, to see that America pursues such course as may not provoke animosity, desire for revenge, and therefore invite attack from any other nation or combination of nations. Second, to be so prepared on land, on water, and especially in the air that if any other nation or combination of nations, disregarding our good will, ignoring our desire to be friends, should attack us for any cause, actual or imaginary, then we will be prepared to defend our people and our possessions, even as the father should be prepared to defend the home of his wife and children against the midnight burglar and assassin.

## DEFENSE PREPAREDNESS NOT PROVOCATIVE OF WAR

Many good people have thought there is danger of provoking war by maintaining a military establishment. They argue that to prepare for war means that ultimately preparation will be consummated by action. It is true that there is much force in this argument when applied to a nation whose powers of taxation and appropriation and of command of military forces and of the right to declare war are all concentrated in the hands of one person. This would be true of such modern autocracies as exist, according to well-established reports, in Italy, Germany, and in Russia. But it could not ever be true of America so long as the Constitution stands and is respected and obeyed by the people and by the Government. Under our Constitution the command of the Army and the Navy rests in the President. But the power of taxation and of appropriation and of declaring war rests in the Congress. The Congress is closely in touch with the feelings of the people. Due to this separation of powers and counterbalance of action, there is no danger that America would ever enter upon a war of aggression. This is especially true when we remember the very small number of Army and Navy officers, even if Reserve officers and National Guard officers are added to the Regular officers, in comparison with the total population. If to this consideration is added the proposal for universal mobilization of manpower and of industry in the event of war, with the provision against profiteering and preparing for payment of the war expenses during the period of such war, so as to eliminate entirely any selfish motive from any group however influential, and to impose upon noncombatants "the burden of paying for the fight while the boys are out fighting", then we have double assurance that the American people would never approve of any action by Congress declaring a war of aggression.

Members of the Congress are so closely in touch with public sentiment that they would not vote for war unless virtually instructed in advance by popular sentiment calling upon them to declare war. This being the case, America is assured that militarism will never ride in control of our policies. Whatever military establishments we have, and whatever armaments and instrumentalities of war we maintain, they are all avowedly and genuinely acquired and will be employed solely for defense. Surely no sane American can ever object to adequate defense. If anyone imagines that America can maintain her power and her prestige and uphold her civilization without armaments, then such person is due to meet a rude awakening. Simply look at the example of China. She has vaster territory than America has, she has more than three times as much population as America has, her resources are equally as rich as America's, and yet for at least 50 years China has been the football of other nations possessing military power. The Chinese have been driven hither and thither like a flock of sheep by a single dog. Whoever could contemplate such a fate for America without hanging his head in shame surely must be a strange mentality. Surely such person is not worthy of the heritage of the fathers who

fought for our independence and gloriously achieved it and set up our representative Government as a result of such fight, and thus established a model of democratic institutions that most of the other nations of the world have since imitated.

Our American Revolutionary fathers fought to gain independence and to establish constitutional freedom, whereby all necessary changes may be made in constitutional, peaceful way, at the ballot box, and we must remain prepared to defend, by war if necessary, this freedom, purchased at the price of blood and suffering.

SENATOR BORAH AND THE ANTILYNCHING BILL

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of the House of Representatives since the World War, and as one who has on numerous occasions spoken and voted for an antilynching bill in Congress, I am willing to concede that the position taken by Senator BORAH on the Costigan-Wagner antilynching bill is sound and probably correct.

Senator BORAH is admittedly the greatest constitutional lawyer in either House of Congress, and it is very evident that he formed his conclusions after careful study as a member of the Judiciary Committee of the Senate to which the bill was referred. He has rendered a service to the colored people by his courageous stand, and it is time that the antilynching bill ceased to be a political football to catch the votes of free American Negroes before election.

Senator BORAH is right. Let us find out where President Roosevelt stands. He is the head of the New Deal administration. Has he ever sent a message to Congress or lifted a finger for the antilynching bill? Where do the other candidates stand on the question of its constitutionality?

My grandfather, Hamilton Fish, as Secretary of State to President Grant, proclaimed the fifteenth amendment, giving the Negroes the right to vote. My father, as speaker of the New York State Assembly, put through the civil rights' bill. As an officer of the gallant old Fifteenth New York colored infantry during the war, I think I know as much about the problems of the colored race as any white man. I led the fight in the American Legion to permit colored veterans to organize their own posts. In Congress I introduced and secured the passage in the House of Representatives of a bill, opposed by practically every southern Democrat, including John N. Garner, now Vice President of the United States; Joseph Byrns, now Speaker of the House of Representatives; and William Bankhead, now Democratic floor leader, as shown by roll call no. 85, page 8395 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 28, 1926, to erect a monument to commemorate the heroism of those colored veterans who paid the supreme sacrifice on the battlefields of France.

Before Oscar DePriest was elected to Congress I handled thousands of compensation cases for colored veterans. I assume I have the right to speak to colored Americans without having my sincerity or record questioned.

I resent the cowardly and unfair attacks that are being made on Senator BORAH in the colored press of the country, because they are hitting below the belt and are not founded on facts. Are they being inspired from Democratic sources through the use of political patronage, or do they emanate from the secret councils of the old guard and reactionary politicians who have never done anything for the colored people except to exploit them?

At any rate, among the untrue and vicious charges is that Senator BORAH used his influence to unseat colored delegates at the Republican national convention. The answer is that Senator BORAH has not been on the committee on credentials since 1912, at which time he favored the nomination of Theodore Roosevelt, and naturally supported the colored delegates who were supporting him. The ousting of colored delegates took place in recent years under the Hoover administration, and Senator BORAH had nothing whatever to do with it.

Senator BORAH is a liberal, and as such is for a square deal for all classes of Americans. He has always opposed persecutions of all racial and religious groups, as witnessed by his denunciation of the interference with religious liberty in

Mexico and the persecution of the Jews in Palestine a few years ago. He is opposed to intolerance in all forms. He has not a drop of racial prejudice in his make-up. The 12,000,000 colored American citizens can be assured of a square deal from him more than from any other living Republican.

He comes nearer to upholding the humanitarian principles of Abraham Lincoln and the Americanism, fearlessness, and square-deal policies of Theodore Roosevelt than any man now in public life.

He is probably the only living Republican statesman who ever saved a colored man from being lynched by an infuriated mob. Back in 1903, at the risk of his life, he saved James Quarles, a colored man, from being taken from the jail at Nampa, Idaho, by a mob seeking to kill him for having shot a white deputy sheriff. Senator BORAH and a deputy sheriff, armed to the teeth, got the colored boy out of the jail, after the mob had broken the door down and marched him through 2,000 people with drawn pistols and put him on a waiting engine and caboose and got away before the mob had the nerve to attack. Later the boy was freed on a plea of self-defense.

Men with racial prejudice do not risk their own lives to save the life of a Negro. Senator BORAH, as a fearless liberal, will see that the 12,000,000 colored people are given a square deal and economic justice, and that is all they have ever asked.

I realize that there is an inspired campaign on to turn the Negro voters against Senator BORAH. It is understandable as an attempted offset to the rising tide of popularity and political strength manifested toward him by the American people.

Let me, as a long-standing friend, say to the colored people that his position in upholding the Constitution is a tremendous service to them. As Al Smith says, the Constitution is the civil bible of America, representing the rights of the minorities, racial and religious. The American Negro has more at stake through undermining or destroying the Constitution than any other group. The thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth amendments are safeguards and guaranties for the civil rights of 12,000,000 colored Americans. Once the Constitution becomes a scrap of paper these guaranties may be wiped out overnight. When such a day comes the colored people under an unfriendly administration may be treated as the Jews now are in Germany, outlawed, deprived of civil and economic rights and liberties, and even denied the right to hold jobs in the Government service or to trade with white people.

My advice to the 12,000,000 colored American citizens is to stand steadfast by the Constitution and all defenders of the Constitution, and particularly by Senator BORAH, who is the greatest and most fearless expounder and upholder of the Constitution in the United States.

Senator BORAH has been in public life for 30 years and has never cast a single vote against any proposal for the benefit of the colored people, such as appropriations for Howard University, or any other such legislation. He voted against the confirmation of Judge Parker, who was known to be antiracial in his views, and none of BORAH's racial critics can show a single piece of legislation he has voted against, except the antilynching bill, and that on clearly sound constitutional grounds.

In this crisis we need strong, sound, and fearless leaders who will stand on and for the Constitution regardless of vote-catching phrases, whether it affects the white or the Negro.

As one who served 2 years in France with a fighting colored regiment and who favors placing machine guns in every jail, North and South, to be used against lawless and murderous mobs seeking to take the law into their own hands, I favor and urge the nomination of WILLIAM E. BORAH on the Republican ticket for President, as a great American, uncompromising champion of the Constitution, outspoken opponent of foreign entanglements and internationalism, and on his fearless record for a square deal for all Americans regardless of race, color, or creed.

It is high time the inspired propaganda emanating from selfish political and partisan sources be exposed to the light of day, before a political wrong has been done and the colored people suffer the natural consequences of the result of vicious and untruthful attacks on a great American who has always stood for a square deal for all.

It is true that under the present administration, and under recent Republican administrations, the colored people have not received a square deal or the patronage that they were entitled to. Under Theodore Roosevelt they did receive proper consideration and treatment. I personally assure and guarantee to the colored people of America that they will receive at the hands of Senator BORAH, if elected President, the same kind of fair treatment, patronage, and economic and political justice under the law and the Constitution as they did under Theodore Roosevelt, and a far squarer deal than they have received for a quarter of a century under either Democratic or Republican administrations.

The answer is up to the colored voters in the Presidential primaries to be held in a few months in such States as Ohio and Illinois. If, in these States, the colored voters listen to inspired and false propaganda and are deceived by misrepresentation of facts, no matter from what source, it will be an unfortunate set-back for the colored people of America. I am not willing to believe that they can be so easily fooled. The truth is mighty and will prevail.

THE LATE VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, CHARLES CURTIS

Mr. GUYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 12 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GUYER. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Members of the Kansas delegation I speak with profoundest regret and sorrow of the death of former Vice President Charles Curtis. Out in Kansas it came with such startling suddenness, like a thought uninvited, like a sudden cry of fear, that the State was stunned by the sad news. It seemed so unbelievable that this vital man of iron will and constitution should be touched by the hand of Death. But—

Leaves have their time to fall,  
And flowers to wither at the north wind's breath,  
And stars to set—but all—  
Thou hast all seasons for thine own, O Death.

Senator Curtis, as he preferred to be called, was a Member of this House for 14 years, and of the Senate 20 years, and 4 years Vice President. His whole life was given to the public service, having been county attorney of Shawnee County, Kans., 4 years before his election to the House in 1892. In that public service he poured out his life like a prodigal spendthrift which rendered him a premature victim of the grim reaper; which again illustrates the havoc wrought by this exacting and corroding official life at the Capital. I have served 10 years in this body under five Speakers, three of whom have answered the last roll call.

Charles Curtis was for nearly a half century the dominant political figure in the State of Kansas, and reached the highest official position any citizen of Kansas ever attained, and he deserved every honor ever conferred upon him. But it is not of his high honors and distinction which his career shed upon his native State that the people of Kansas are thinking today as he returns on the last home-coming. Out there today on the prairies and in the cities and villages of his beloved Kansas they are not thinking of the Congressman Curtis of long ago, of the great majority leader of the United States Senate, nor of Vice President Curtis; but deep in their affections they are thinking of one they called "Charley" Curtis, or just "Charley", as he was lovingly known to hundreds and thousands in these five and forty years which embraced his public career.

For 30 years he has been my warm, loyal, unfaltering friend; always ready to give his wise and unselfish advice and counsel; and thousands of Kansans, regardless of party, today, like myself, will bow in deepest sorrow above the bier of one who was in the highest and truest sense a sincere and loyal friend—the rarest thing in the world. Today this good man comes back to his beloved Kansas to sleep beneath the sod

he loved so well, rich in the loving memory of his myriad friends and opulent in the good will of a grateful Republic, to whose welfare he gave his life so unreservedly and so faithfully. Peace be to his ashes, and sweet be his rest.

WALTER HINES PAGE

The SPEAKER. Under a special order, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. LAMBETH] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me for a moment?

Mr. LAMBETH. I yield.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from North Carolina is about to deliver an address on a subject of great importance and I believe of general interest. I believe that ample time should be allowed him, and therefore I ask unanimous consent that he be permitted to address the House for 40 minutes instead of 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from North Carolina be extended 10 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. I shall not object to this extension, but we have a program which we are very anxious to carry forward as soon as we can. The War Department appropriation bill is waiting to be taken up after the District of Columbia business is disposed of.

Mr. SNELL. Is the War Department appropriation bill to be taken up immediately?

Mr. BANKHEAD. After the disposal of business in order on District day. We expect to take it up for general debate.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LAMBETH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks by inserting at the conclusion thereof the message of President Wilson to Congress on April 2, 1917, and to insert certain correspondence and excerpts with reference to the subject of my address.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LAMBETH. Mr. Speaker, in the generation just preceding mine, a family by the name of Page contributed five brothers, all of them distinguished for public service. No man in North Carolina would dare rise in any public forum or write upon paper which might meet the eyes of the public any intimation or insinuation or innuendo attaching upon the character and honor of those five brothers. Four of them now sleep in the churchyard of Old Bethesda, near Aberdeen, N. C.

One of them represented for 16 years in this body the district which I now have the honor of serving. Some of the older Members will recall the quality and statesmanship of Robert Newton Page. Mr. Speaker, I would that I had time this morning to pay tribute to the life and character and public service of Robert Page, but time will not permit. On some other occasion I hope to have the opportunity to pay fitting tribute to him.

Another brother who distinguished himself for public service was Frank Page, for years chairman of the State Highway Commission for North Carolina. Under his chairmanship more than \$100,000,000 was spent for construction of a system of modern highways throughout the length and breadth of North Carolina than which there is none superior in all the world. That money was spent without ever a hint or suspicion or any breath of scandal. On the contrary, it has been stated that Frank Page broke more highway contractors than any man in this country ever did, so correct was his integrity.

Another brother who lies sleeping in that old Scotch churchyard is Henry A. Page, who served as food administrator for North Carolina during the World War. He also served several terms in the North Carolina House of Representatives, where he was noted for his fearlessness as well as ability. It might be of interest to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TINKHAM] to know that this Page once

defied upon the floor of the house the superintendent of the Anti-Saloon League of North Carolina, as a result of which he was defeated in the next election. And while this has no connection whatever with my subject, I might say it takes more courage to defy the Anti-Saloon League in North Carolina than in Massachusetts.

These three brothers, together with the only surviving brother, J. R. Page, I have known personally, and two of them intimately, and may I say that Robert Page, next to my own father, was more responsible than any other one man for my coming here as Representative of the old Seventh North Carolina District.

The fourth brother, who lies sleeping beneath the pines at Old Bethesda, I never knew personally. Due to his position he achieved greater fame than his brothers. Walter Hines Page was born at Cary, N. C., August 15, 1855. He was a student at old Trinity College, North Carolina, then at Randolph-Macon College in Virginia, and did graduate work at Johns Hopkins University.

Entering the field of journalism, for more than 30 years he held important positions with various publications, notably on the staff of the New York Evening Post, editor of the Forum, Atlantic Monthly, and World's Work.

From 1913-18 Page was Ambassador to the Court of St. James. In this position his labors were so unceasing that his health was broken and he was compelled to resign in August 1918 and return to this country. He died December 21, 1918, on the North Carolina soil he loved so well, and was buried at Old Bethesda, under the longleaf pines, "down in the old country where the sands are white and the air clean."

Mr. Speaker, I have always heard that tropical heat waves had an effect on men's minds, often driving them mad, but I believe now that blizzards must sometimes have the same effect. Last Thursday the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TINKHAM] arose on this floor, not speaking extemporaneously in the heat of debate but reading from a manuscript written in advance, and made the bold assertion, and I quote from his remarks:

According to his own written declarations, Mr. House was responsible for the appointment of Walter Hines Page as United States Ambassador to the Court of St. James. At a later date I intend to submit to the House evidence to warrant the charge that Mr. Page conducted himself traitorously in that important office.

Mr. Speaker, it is a very serious charge to say that any man, even in time of peace, is a traitor to his own country, but in time of war for even a private soldier—and I happen to have been a private soldier—to give any information to the enemy there is but one penalty, and that is death. But even that does not approach in gravity the insinuation that an Ambassador of this Government in time of war was a traitor, coming as it did from a Representative, a responsible Member of Congress. That is the most shocking statement that I have ever heard made by any man in public office during my lifetime. I could not believe my own eyes as I read it the following morning in the newspapers and in the RECORD!

Who's Who states that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TINKHAM] fired the first shot against the Austrians after war was declared between the United States and Austria. He was in this House when I was in the Army. It was given to me to fire some shots against the enemy, and I think that I know something of war at first hand. But it has not been given to me to make 24 visits abroad, because I do not possess the means of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TINKHAM]; and, more important, the demands of my constituents are such that even if I had the means and the inclination I could not absent myself from my post of duty for such indulgence. I have had only a bare acquaintance with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TINKHAM] during my three terms here, until recently when the Committee on Foreign Affairs began hearings on the neutrality bill. During that period, sitting across the table, we engaged in several verbal clashes, none of which left any sting whatsoever with me, and I am frank to confess that I had

become extremely fond of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TINKHAM] as I became better acquainted with him.

It is common knowledge that he has in his apartment many trophies, among which are the heads of lions and other wild beasts which he delights to hunt on the continents of Africa and Asia. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TINKHAM] does not hunt small game. He does not go to Scotland to shoot grouse; he goes to Africa to shoot elephants. I rather suspect that he has in his apartment the scalps of the League of Nations and the World Court, and you will all remember the spasms of oratory which he exhibited here on the closing night of the Seventy-third Congress when he attempted to defeat a simple resolution providing that our Government send representatives to the International Labor Office at Geneva.

But there is one scalp that the big-game hunter does not have, and that is the scalp of the British lion, although it is common knowledge that he has already declared war on Great Britain! Indeed, in the course of his wild declamation last Thursday he made the nonsensical accusation that our State Department was a sort of subsidiary of the British Foreign Office under the Wilson, Hoover, and Roosevelt administrations. What could be more absurd?

Secretary Hull and Assistant Secretary Moore were both Members of this House during recent years, and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TINKHAM] knows them well enough to realize himself how completely he lost his sense of proportion and of propriety on that occasion. The best description which could be given his performance of last Thursday is a quixotic tilting at a windmill.

But on Thursday he turned his Big Bertha for a long-distance shot upon a tomb at Old Bethesda. Only one thing would have shocked me more, and that would have been that the gentleman here had risen and announced that he had documents to prove that the Unknown Soldier was the son of an expatriated Englishman and therefore he was a British spy.

I do not intend to impugn the motives of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TINKHAM]. Even if I wished to do so, the rules of this House would not permit it, and I do not wish my emotions and deep resentment to carry me beyond the limits of parliamentary language. I do not believe in dealing with personalities, whether on or off the floor of the House. While I do not impugn the motives of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TINKHAM], I do think that his judgment is bad and his ideas are queer, and I cannot imagine any other Representative who would have had such a brainstorm.

In connection with the neutrality bill about which the gentleman had so much to say in his remarks, during the hearings before the Committee on Foreign Affairs he took a very active part. He brought down a battery of professors to shoot the bill to pieces. The interesting thing about it was that none of the professors agreed with his position. In fact, it is very rare that anyone is found who agrees completely with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TINKHAM]. He is the arch isolationist of the United States, and perhaps the whole world. I imagine that he will consider this as a great compliment. For myself, Mr. Speaker, let it be understood that his philosophy and mine are almost as far apart as the Poles; or better, as far removed as the Equator is from the Poles, because otherwise the gentleman would say that I am an internationalist and favor the entrance of the United States into the League of Nations. That is not my position at all. When anyone disagrees with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TINKHAM], he immediately labels that person as an internationalist or an advocate of the League of Nations. Reduced to an absurdity, his philosophy means simply this: That under no circumstances would there be any cooperation between our Government and foreign governments, and in the event of war he would close our ports. In other words, he would have the United States out-China China in order to make completely effective his philosophy of extreme isolationism.

But when the time came to vote upon reporting out the bill, the gentleman was not even present in the committee

although he has more decided views regarding these questions than any man or woman on the committee.

He has consistently opposed every proposal for peace. During all the years he has been here he has advocated no constructive legislation. If he has ever proposed anything to help prevent war, I should like to know what it was.

As to the charge that Colonel House was responsible for Page's appointment as ambassador—if this were true, it would have been a matter in which he could have taken pride. Such, however, was not the case. When Page was 26 years old, doing work in Atlanta for a New York newspaper, he met Wilson, then a struggling young lawyer 25 years old. Until Page died, these two kept in touch with each other—Wilson often contributing to Page's magazines. Page prevailed upon Wilson to be a candidate for the governorship of New Jersey and threw himself with fervor into the task of securing the Presidential nomination for Wilson, because Wilson represented the ideals which Page cherished. He suggested that Wilson deliver his message to Congress in person, which Wilson did.

Page introduced Colonel House to Wilson at the request of Colonel House, who had never met him and wished to be presented by one of whom Wilson thought highly. This introduction took place before Wilson's first nomination for the Presidency. Wilson thought so highly of Page that he consulted him freely as to Cabinet appointments. From these facts it would appear that Wilson's choice of Page as his ambassador was entirely his own.

Walter Hines Page was a gentleman; not only a gentleman but a Christian gentleman, even if that term is becoming a little obsolete. What do I mean by a gentleman? The best definition I can give is that of Irwin Laughlin, a fair-minded Republican, himself a gentleman and a distinguished diplomat, who was counselor in the Embassy at London while Page was Ambassador. He was daily at his elbow, knew him intimately, and thought so highly of Page that he made the following statement:

A gentleman is a man of gentle and considerate feelings, of courteous demeanor, of just perceptions, of sound principles, of unflinching truthfulness, of loyal devotion, of self-forgetfulness, of courage. To all this Walter Page added a whimsical sense of humor, good judgment, and that very uncommon endowment, sound common sense, and with such qualities there is no need of the showy attributes of genius for great accomplishment. The many and complex problems with which he had to do in London from the beginning of August 1914 were to him, as far as his own action was concerned, comparatively simple. He knew his duty and he did it.

He was an audacious truth teller. He felt that he was sent over to England to report the whole truth. At first it was surprising, then irksome, and at last irresistible. Wilson once said that if anyone wanted to get him to do something the best approach would be to get Page to write him a letter. What is an ambassador for, anyway? A cynical person has defined an ambassador as a man sent to lie abroad for the good of his country, but Page all his life had been noted for speaking the truth regardless of the reaction at the moment. He felt that he was sent there to do it.

At this point I quote from pages 240 and 241 of a book entitled "Old Bethesda", recently written by the late Bion Butler, of Southern Pines, N. C., an independent Republican:

Fortunately for this country and for the whole world, another broad mind, Woodrow Wilson, when the German Kaiser opened his gates of hell, had made Page the representative of this Government in Great Britain. Two men who knew each other, unafraid, moved by loftiest motives, were at the helm when the storm let loose. Walter Page gaged the solid integrity of the British people and the faculty they have of hanging to the right and to the common world good. When an emotional wave would have made it possible for the United States to add to Britain's tremendous tasks by lending aid to the Germans, Page in positive language told Wilson, "No." Wilson knew Page was right. Walter Page would not let the country embarrass Great Britain, and that courageous stand saved the world from becoming the suzerainty of a German war lord and German absolute monarchy. A few people realize what a narrow margin kept us from becoming an ally of the German to destroy the British savior of government by the people. But some day perhaps a monument at the hands of a world-wide popular contribution will tell how much more clearly men see things sometimes after the history is made than during its making. And he who saved the world for freedom of the whole people came back in his democracy to await the solution of the common mys-

tery that is the tomb, back to the cardinal principles of the rights of man and the sovereignty of the individual, among his neighbors and friends.

Page as Ambassador will take rank among the foremost of all time. Never have we had abroad an envoy who had better knowledge of our history—political, economic, and social—than did Page. Persistent and intelligent, he was always striving to better the lot of the human race. He was a democrat and also an aristocrat in the best sense of the word. A man of tender sympathy, he had faith and hope for the peoples of the world. There was no subtlety or mystery or cunning or self-delusion in his make-up; he was a big, wholesome human being. His was the open diplomacy, direct diplomacy, the diplomacy of candor.

His life was gentle, and the elements  
So mix'd in him that Nature might stand up,  
And say to all the world "This was a man!"

During his service as our Ambassador he wrote three resignations; first, when the campaign of 1916 was on; the second one he wrote and tore up at Laughlin's urging; the third the President had to accept, because he was dying. Ambassadors are often regarded as ornamental appendages of the country, but Page gave his lifeblood in service to America.

In addition to all these other great qualities of spirit and mind, he had the most wonderful ability for writing letters. No man in recent years has been his equal as a letter writer. And such letters! Beautiful in engraved-like handwriting, finished in thought, turbulent with strident common sense and radiant hope, in virile humor. If he shall not be adjudged the best letter writer of his generation I shall be much mistaken.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when I rose on Friday to ask unanimous consent to address the House today I made the statement that the dead Ambassador could not speak for himself. Upon second thought I realize, however, that he can speak for himself more eloquently than any living man. Therefore I am going to ask your indulgence while I read two letters, one which he wrote his brother, Robert N. Page, never heretofore published, and the other which he wrote from London to his son Frank, who was then at Aberdeen with his mother, it being the first Christmas after the war began. I ask you to listen for several reasons. In the first place, to my mind, they are the most complete answers that can be given to the accusation of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TINKHAM], for they show the real love of Mr. Page for his home country and his hatred of war.

6 GROSVENOR SQUARE, November 27, 1914.

MY DEAR BOB: Truth in this world? Old Pontius Pilate never saw half the difficulties of getting it. This kingdom belongs to the past. The whole future is ours. We are so much bigger, stronger, happier, surer of the future that any American here with half sense has continually to restrain himself from saying so. I am always afraid that I'll boast, afraid even that I'll blurt out some day some such question as this: "Now, since the whole future of the world belongs to America and since we feel most kindly to you as our kinsmen and to your country as the chief motherland of our people and of our institutions, what do you want us to do with you, when we definitely assume command of the world?"

And yet I'm pictured as bowing down to 'em, etc., and—what do you call it?—abasing myself and my country.

What I'd like to know is whether these fellows who say this and say that the President ought to be impeached for treason and that Andy Carnegie is selling out American liberty, do they really believe these things or are they simply common gutter liars? I can't make out, in my amazement.

Truckle to Great Britain? It's these fellows that do that—not I. Isn't it funny? Such a reputation as I have made here at all is a reputation for bluntness, for plain speaking, for forgetting the usual ambassadorial courtesies. Men said to me the night of the famous speech: "How you do hit us!" Then at home, I'm regarded as a truckler? Or, am I? Is it all stage thunder, or are you all gone crazy?

As I said, old Pontius Pilate "wasn't in it." If any bomb is laid for me, cable me (not signing your name). Or am I forgotten in their fight on the President?

Affectionately,

W. H. P.

TO FRANK C. PAGE

SUNDAY, DECEMBER 20, 1914.

DEAR OLD MAN: I envy both you and your mother your chance to make plans for the farm and the house and all the rest of it and to have one another to talk to, and, most of all, you are where

you can now and then change the subject. You can guess somewhat of our plight when Kitty and I confessed to one another last night that we were dead tired and needed to go to bed early and to stay long. She's sleeping yet, the dear kid, and I hope she'll sleep till lunch time. There isn't anything the matter with us but the war, but that's enough, Heaven knows. It's the worst ailment that has ever struck me. Then, if you add to that this dark, wet, foggy, sooty, cold, penetrating climate, you ought to thank your stars that you are not in it. I'm glad your mother's out of it, as much as we miss her; and miss her? Good gracious! There's no telling the hole her absence makes in all our life. But Kitty is a trump, true blue and dead game, and the very best company you can find in a day's journey; and, much as we miss your mother, you mustn't weep for us; we are having some fun and are planning more. I could have no end of fun with her if I had any time. But to work all day and till bedtime doesn't leave much time for sport.

The farm—the farm—it's yours and mother's, to plan and make and do with as you wish. I shall be happy whatever you do, even if you put the roof in the cellar and the cellar on the top of the house.

If you have room enough (16 by 10 plus a fire and a bath are enough for me), I'll go down there and write a book. If you haven't it, I'll go somewhere else and write a book. I don't propose to be made unhappy by any house or by the lack of any house nor by anything whatsoever.

All the details of life go on here just the same. The war goes as slowly as death, because it is death, death to millions of men. We've all said all we know about it to one another a thousand times; nobody knows anything else; nobody can guess when it will end; nobody has any doubt about how it will end, unless some totally improbable and unexpected thing happens, such as the falling out of the Allies, which can't happen, for none of them can afford it; and we go around the same bloody circle all the time. The papers never have any news; nobody ever talks about anything else; everybody is tired to death; nobody is cheerful; when it isn't sick Belgians it's airplanes; and when it isn't airplanes its bombarding the coast of England. When it isn't an American ship held up it's a fool American-German arrested as a spy; and when it isn't a spy it's a liar who knows the Zeppelins are coming tonight. We don't know anything; we don't believe anybody; we should be surprised at nothing; and at 3 o'clock I'm going to the abbey to a service in honor of the 100 years of peace! The world has all got itself so jumbled up that the bays are all promontories, the mountains are all valleys, and earthquakes are necessary for our happiness. We have disasters for breakfast, mined ships for luncheon, burned cities for dinner, trenches in our dreams, and bombarded towns for small talk.

Peaceful seems the sandy landscape where you are, glad the very blackjacks, happy the curs, blessed the sheep, interesting the chin-whiskered clodhopper, innocent the fool darkey, blessed the mule, for it knows no war. And you have your mother; be happy, boy; you don't know how much you have to be thankful for.

Europe is ceasing to be interesting except as an example of how-not-to-do-it. It has no lessons for us except as a warning, when the whole continent has to go fighting, every blessed one of them, once a century, and half of them half the time between and all prepared even when they are not fighting, and when they shoot away all their money as soon as they begin to get rich a little, and everybody else's money, too, and make the whole world poor; and when they kill every third or fourth generation of the best men and leave the worst to rear families, and have to start over afresh every time with a worse stock, give me Uncle Sam and his big farm. We don't need to catch any of this European life. We can do without it all as well as we can do without the judges' wigs and the court costumes. Besides, I like a land where the potatoes have some flavor, where you can buy a cigar, and get your hair cut, and have warm bathrooms.

Build the farm, therefore, and let me hear at every stage of that happy game. May the New Year be the best that has ever come for you.

Affectionately,

W. H. P.

"Kitty" referred to in this letter was his daughter. She is now Mrs. Charles G. Loring, of Boston, Mass.

I shall pause in order that any man within the hearing of my voice may rise in his place who believes that Page was a traitor or that he was pro-British or pro-anything except pro-American. I will not be able to yield even for a question, because my time is fast slipping away. I simply want the RECORD to show the name of any Member who believes that this gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TINKHAM] spoke the truth. [No Member rose.]

Frank Copeland Page, a son of Walter Hines Page, was in the service during the World War. Five nephews of Walter Hines Page—J. R. Page, Jr., R. A. Page, William F. Page, R. N. Page, Jr., and Allison Page—were also in the service. Allison Page, a marine, lost his life at Chateau-Thierry. The son-in-law of Walter Hines Page—Charles G. Loring—was also in the service.

Not only did his son go to war, and his nephews, one of whom died on the field of honor, but Page himself gave his own life to the country just as truly as did Wilson. It ill becomes any Member of the American Congress now, at this

late date, to impugn the motives, character, and integrity of one of the greatest Americans of all times.

Why, then, at this late date, 12 years after the letters of Walter Hines Page were published, why are these charges now made? There can be but one answer, and that is that gentlemen who have certain views concerning this neutrality legislation wish to stir up mob spirit, incite false propaganda, muddy the waters, and becloud issues involved in the great decision now confronting the Congress and the American people.

Not one of these four Pages now sleeping at Old Bethesda was a demagogue. They differed honestly, but did not question the motives of others. For instance, Representative Robert Page favored the McLemore resolution, warning our citizens that they would travel on armed ships at their own risk.

Ah, Mr. Speaker, I am sick and tired of hypocrisy and demagoguery, of insincerity in high as well as low places. [Applause.] God save America from demagoguery! The demagogues are the worst enemy in our land. What is a demagogue? I looked up the word in the new English Dictionary and quote:

A leader of a popular faction or of the mob; a political agitator who appeals to the passions and prejudices of the mob in order to obtain power or further his own interests; an unprincipled or factious popular orator.

Your Committee on Foreign Affairs held dignified hearings on the neutrality bill. It was a serious attempt to settle a most complicated problem and out of the best composite judgment of the minds of that committee to write an American neutrality policy. There was no sensationalism, no use of poison gas or hurling of stink bombs. With one exception no member of that committee has sought the headlines with innuendoes or insinuations.

I am not opposed to investigations if they accomplish anything, if they reveal any information not previously known that will aid in framing proper legislation; but I am opposed to wasting the money of the taxpayers of this country for no purpose other than to stir up propaganda and to publicize certain persons without serving any useful public purpose. [Applause.]

These ghouls and vandals, in order to further their own selfish ends, go at night to the sepulchres of the dead, drag out their corpses, smear them, holding them up as traitors and liars while they sneer with insinuations and innuendoes.

I do not possess the vocabulary of the Senator from Virginia and I fear that I will be unable to restrain myself as admirably as did he recently upon a similar occasion in another body. Is the Congress of the United States to become a National Order of Ghouls? No wonder we are held in contempt by a large segment of thinking public opinion in this country!

As I sometimes pass the heights of St. Albans, on which is rising the National Cathedral, in which the mortal remains of Wilson are buried, memory brings back to me the day when I, as a college boy, saw him inaugurated as President, and that other day in December 1918, when I saw him arrive in Paris, aged beyond his years, carrying on his shoulders the burden of the world. He was not only Commander-in-Chief of our Army and Navy but he was the captain of the ideals and hopes of the common peoples not only of America but of the entire world. His was the world vision, and though his dreams of setting up a plan to outlaw war have not yet come true, the League still lives and is the only hope of the world that another great European war may be averted.

The eagle has passed on \* \* \* into the blue \* \* \*  
And all the chattering of the sparrows dies  
They could not bear to see the eagle rise  
Beyond the reaches that their small wings knew.  
Above the housetops they could compass, too—  
But though they strove to blind the eagle's eyes  
With fluttering wings \* \* \* to stay him with their cries  
He rose and passed—above, beyond their view.

An eagle always is a lonely one—  
The far heights call to him and he must go;  
But little birds cannot look on the sun,  
And what an eagle knows they cannot know \* \* \*  
When he is gone the small ones know, at last,  
That there, above their heads, an eagle passed.

We all know that lately in another place the dead as well as the living have been assailed, a ghoulish propensity of sick minds mistaking abuse for argument and diatribe for dialectics that ought not to spread to this House. We also know of the proper rebuke that was administered; a castigation which ended by leaving nothing to be said but the inexpressible. Words of mine are inadequate to express my indignation and contempt. I, therefore, borrow the words of Shelley, one of the greatest poets who, in writing of the critics who destroyed his young friend, John Keats, used these words:

The herded wolves, bold only to pursue;  
The obscene ravens, clamorous o'er the dead;  
The vultures to the conqueror's banner true  
Who feed where desolation first has fed.

[Applause.]

President Alderman, of the University of Virginia, in his notable address in this Chamber on the occasion of the memorial for Woodrow Wilson, said:

He was afame with will to advance the slow ascent of man.

These words might have just as truly been spoken of Walter Page, for no two men lived during that critical period who had a closer bond of spiritual kinship and understanding than they. They were two Southern gentlemen.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TINKHAM] has classed Walter Page with Judas Iscariot and Benedict Arnold. Like Cyrano de Bergerac, as he walked off the stage of human action, Walter Page carried with him his white plume, and no attempt of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TINKHAM] can besmirch or besmear that white plume.

Mr. Speaker, having stated the philosophy of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TINKHAM] and his allies who would have this country become a second-rate world power and not only lose the respect of the other great nations but sacrifice even our own self-respect, not to speak of our economic stake in foreign trade, I wish to declare unhesitatingly my own philosophy with reference to these matters. Let no man understand that I profess to speak for the administration, for the Committee on Foreign Affairs, or for any other man or set of men, but solely my own views in this matter. I believe in the theory of common security; that the peace of the world cannot be maintained by nations acting individually and alone. That means that I believe in what is known as the policy of naming the aggressor nation: whenever two-thirds of the signatories of the Kellogg pact shall meet and declare that an aggressor has broken its pledge and has proceeded by force in violation of commitments made between itself and other nations, thereupon the President of the United States shall inform the Congress of the facts, submit his recommendation, and the Congress shall proceed in the light of its own judgment and of the sentiment of the American people at that time to lay unilateral embargoes against that aggressor nation. In other words, I simply mean that international outlaws should be treated like domestic outlaws. I believe this not only as a matter of good morals but as a matter of good common sense, for the only way to prevent war and to keep ourselves from becoming involved in war is to cooperate, always having our own interest foremost in mind, and without involving ourselves in entangling alliances, to choke to death, if need be, such lawless nations before hell breaks loose upon the continent of Europe or elsewhere in the civilized world.

[Applause.]

ADDRESS OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES DELIVERED AT A JOINT SESSION OF THE TWO HOUSES OF CONGRESS, APRIL 2, 1917

Gentlemen of the Congress, I have called the Congress into extraordinary session because there are serious, very serious, choices of policy to be made, and made immediately, which it was neither right nor constitutionally permissible that I should assume the responsibility of making.

On the 3d of February last I officially laid before you the extraordinary announcement of the Imperial German Government that on and after the 1st day of February it was its purpose to put aside all restraints of law or of humanity and use its submarines to sink every vessel that sought to approach either the ports of Great Britain and Ireland or the western coasts of Europe or any of the ports controlled by the enemies of Germany within the Mediterranean. That had seemed to be the object of the German submarine warfare earlier in the war, but since April of last year the Imperial Government had somewhat restrained the commanders

of its undersea craft in conformity with its promise then given to us that passenger boats should not be sunk and that due warning would be given to all other vessels which its submarines might seek to destroy, when no resistance was offered or escape attempted, and care taken that their crews were given at least a fair chance to save their lives in their open boats. The precautions taken were meager and haphazard enough, as was proved in distressing instance after instance in the progress of the cruel and unmanly business, but a certain degree of restraint was observed. The new policy has swept every restriction aside. Vessels of every kind, whatever their flag, their character, their cargo, their destination, their errand, have been ruthlessly sent to the bottom without warning and without thought of help or mercy for those on board, the vessels of friendly neutrals along with those of belligerents. Even hospital ships and ships carrying relief to the sorely bereaved and stricken people of Belgium, though the latter were provided with safe conduct through the proscribed areas by the German Government itself and were distinguished by unmistakable marks of identity, have been sunk with the same reckless lack of compassion or of principle.

I was for a little while unable to believe that such things would in fact be done by any government that had hitherto subscribed to the humane practices of civilized nations. International law had its origin in the attempt to set up some law which would be respected and observed upon the seas, where no nation had right of dominion and where lay the free highways of the world. By painful stage after stage has that law been built up, with meager enough results, indeed, after all was accomplished that could be accomplished, but always with a clear view, at least, of what the heart and conscience of mankind demanded. This minimum of right the German Government has swept aside under the plea of retaliation and necessity and because it had no weapons which it could use at sea except these which it is impossible to employ as it is employing them without throwing to the winds all scruples of humanity or of respect for the understandings that were supposed to underlie the intercourse of the world. I am not now thinking of the loss of property involved, immense and serious as that is, but only of the wanton and wholesale destruction of the lives of noncombatants, men, women, and children, engaged in pursuits which have always, even in the darkest periods of modern history, been deemed innocent and legitimate. Property can be paid for; the lives of peaceful and innocent people cannot be. The present German submarine warfare against commerce is a warfare against mankind.

It is a war against all nations. American ships have been sunk, American lives taken in ways which it has stirred us very deeply to learn of, but the ships and people of other neutral and friendly nations have been sunk and overwhelmed in the waters in the same way. There has been no discrimination. The challenge is to all mankind. Each nation must decide for itself how it will meet it. The choice we make for ourselves must be made with a moderation of counsel and a temperateness of judgment befitting our character and our motives as a nation. We must put excited feeling away. Our motive will not be revenge or the victorious assertion of the physical might of the nation, but only the vindication of right, of human right, of which we are only a single champion.

When I addressed the Congress on the 26th of February last I thought that it would suffice to assert our neutral rights with arms, our right to use the seas against unlawful interference, our right to keep our people safe against unlawful violence. But armed neutrality, it now appears, is impracticable. Because submarines are in effect outlaws when used as the German submarines have been used against merchant shipping, it is impossible to defend ships against their attacks as the law of nations has assumed that merchantmen would defend themselves against privateers or cruisers, visible craft giving chase upon the open sea. It is common prudence in such circumstances, grim necessity indeed, to endeavor to destroy them before they have shown their own intention. They must be dealt with upon sight, if dealt with at all. The German Government denies the right of neutrals to use arms at all within the areas of the sea which it has proscribed, even in the defense of rights which no modern publicist has ever before questioned their right to defend. The intimation is conveyed that the armed guards which we have placed on our merchant ships will be treated as beyond the pale of law and subject to be dealt with as pirates would be. Armed neutrality is ineffectual enough at best; in such circumstances and in the face of such pretensions it is worse than ineffectual; it is likely only to produce what it was meant to prevent; it is practically certain to draw us into the war without either the rights or the effectiveness of belligerents. There is one choice we cannot make, we are incapable of making: we will not choose the path of submission and suffer the most sacred rights of our Nation and our people to be ignored or violated. The wrongs against which we now array ourselves are no common wrongs; they cut to the very roots of human life.

With a profound sense of the solemn and even tragical character of the step I am taking and of the grave responsibilities which it involves, but in unhesitating obedience to what I deem my constitutional duty, I advise that the Congress declare the recent course of the Imperial German Government to be in fact nothing less than war against the Government and people of the United States; that it formally accept the status of belligerent which has thus been thrust upon it; and that it take immediate steps not only to put the country in a more thorough state of defense but also to exert all its power and employ all its resources to bring the Government of the German Empire to terms and end the war.

What this will involve is clear. It will involve the utmost practicable cooperation in counsel and action with the governments

now at war with Germany, and, as incident to that, the extension to those governments of the most liberal financial credits, in order that our resources may so far as possible be added to theirs. It will involve the organization and mobilization of all the material resources of the country to supply the materials of war and serve the incidental needs of the Nation in the most abundant and yet the most economical and efficient way possible. It will involve the immediate full equipment of the Navy in all respects but particularly in supplying it with the best means of dealing with the enemy's submarines. It will involve the immediate addition to the armed forces of the United States already provided for by law in case of war at least 500,000 men, who should, in my opinion, be chosen upon the principle of universal liability to service, and also the authorization of subsequent additional increments of equal force so soon as they may be needed and can be handled in training. It will involve also, of course, the granting of adequate credits to the Government, sustained, I hope, so far as they can equitably be sustained by the present generation, by well-conceived taxation.

I say sustained so far as may be equitable by taxation because it seems to me that it would be most unwise to base the credits which will now be necessary entirely on money borrowed. It is our duty, I most respectfully urge, to protect our people so far as we may against the very serious hardships and evils which would be likely to arise out of the inflation which would be produced by vast loans.

In carrying out the measures by which these things are to be accomplished we should keep constantly in mind the wisdom of interfering as little as possible in our own preparation and in the equipment of our own military forces with the duty—for it will be a very practical duty—of supplying the nations already at war with Germany with the materials which they can obtain only from us or by our assistance. They are in the field and we should help them in every way to be effective there.

I shall take the liberty of suggesting, through the several executive departments of the Government, for the consideration of your committees, measures for the accomplishment of the several objects I have mentioned. I hope that it will be your pleasure to deal with them as having been framed after very careful thought by the branch of the Government upon which the responsibility of conducting the war and safeguarding the Nation will most directly fall.

While we do these things, these deeply momentous things, let us be very clear, and make very clear to all the world what our motives and our objects are. My own thought has not been driven from its habitual and normal course by the unhappy events of the last 2 months, and I do not believe that the thought of the Nation has been altered or clouded by them. I have exactly the same things in mind now that I had in mind when I addressed the Senate on the 22d of January last; the same that I had in mind when I addressed the Congress on the 3d of February and on the 26th of February. Our object now, as then, is to vindicate the principles of peace and justice in the life of the world as against selfish and autocratic power and to set up amongst the really free and self-governed peoples of the world such a concert of purpose and of action as will henceforth insure the observance of those principles. Neutrality is no longer feasible or desirable where the peace of the world is involved and the freedom of its peoples, and the menace to that peace and freedom lies in the existence of autocratic governments backed by organized force which is controlled wholly by their will, not by the will of their people. We have seen the last of neutrality in such circumstances. We are at the beginning of an age in which it will be insisted that the same standards of conduct and of responsibility for wrong done shall be observed among nations and their governments that are observed among the individual citizens of civilized states.

We have no quarrel with the German people. We have no feeling toward them but one of sympathy and friendship. It was not upon their impulse that their Government acted in entering this war. It was not with their previous knowledge or approval. It was a war determined upon as wars used to be determined upon in the old, unhappy days when peoples were nowhere consulted by their rulers and wars were provoked and waged in the interest of dynasties or of little groups of ambitious men who were accustomed to use their fellow men as pawns and tools. Self-governed nations do not fill their neighbor states with spies or set the course of intrigue to bring about some critical posture of affairs which will give them an opportunity to strike and make conquest. Such designs can be successfully worked out only under cover and where no one has the right to ask questions. Cunningly contrived plans of deception or aggression, carried, it may be, from generation to generation, can be worked out and kept from the light only within the privacy of courts or behind the carefully guarded confidences of a narrow and privileged class. They are happily impossible where public opinion commands and insists upon full information concerning all the nation's affairs.

A steadfast concert for peace can never be maintained except by a partnership of democratic nations. No autocratic government could be trusted to keep faith within it or observe its covenants. It must be a league of honor, a partnership of opinion. Intrigue would eat its vitals away; the plottings of inner circles who could plan what they would and render account to no one would be a corruption seated at its very heart. Only free peoples can hold their purpose and their honor steady to a common end and prefer the interests of mankind to any narrow interest of their own.

Does not every American feel that assurance has been added to our hope for the future peace of the world by the wonderful and heartening things that have been happening within the last few

weeks in Russia? Russia was known by those who knew it best to have been always in fact democratic at heart, in all the vital habits of her thought, in all the intimate relationships of her people that spoke their natural instinct, their habitual attitude toward life. The autocracy that crowned the summit of her political structure, long as it had stood and terrible as was the reality of its power, was not in fact Russian in origin, character, or purpose; and now it has been shaken off and the great, generous Russian people have been added in all their naive majesty and might to the forces that are fighting for freedom in the world, for justice, and for peace. Here is a fit partner for a league of honor.

One of the things that has served to convince us that the Prussian autocracy was not and could never be our friend is that from the very outset of the present war it has filled our unsuspecting communities and even our offices of government with spies and set criminal intrigues everywhere afoot against our national unity of counsel, our peace within and without, our industries, and our commerce. Indeed, it is now evident that its spies were here even before the war began; and it is unhappily not a matter of conjecture but a fact proved in our courts of justice that the intrigues which have more than once become perilously near to disturbing the peace and dislocating the industries of the country have been carried on at the instigation, with the support, and even under the personal direction of official agents of the Imperial Government accredited to the Government of the United States. Even in checking these things and trying to extirpate them we have sought to put the most generous interpretation possible upon them because we knew that their source lay, not in any hostile feeling or purpose of the German people toward us (who were, no doubt, as ignorant of them as we ourselves were), but only in the selfish designs of a Government that did what it pleased and told its people nothing. But they have played their part in serving to convince us at last that that Government entertains no real friendship for us and means to act against our peace and security at its convenience. That it means to stir up enemies against us at our very doors the intercepted note to the German Minister at Mexico City is eloquent evidence.

We are accepting this challenge of hostile purpose because we know that in such a government, following such methods, we can never have a friend; and that in the presence of its organized power, always lying in wait to accomplish we know not what purpose, there can be no assured security for the democratic governments of the world. We are now about to accept gage of battle with this natural foe to liberty and shall, if necessary, spend the whole force of the Nation to check and nullify its pretensions and its power. We are glad, now that we see the facts with no veil of false pretense about them, to fight thus for the ultimate peace of the world and for the liberation of its peoples, the German peoples included: for the rights of nations great and small and the privilege of men everywhere to choose their way of life and of obedience. The world must be made safe for democracy. Its peace must be planted upon the tested foundations of political liberty. We have no selfish ends to serve. We desire no conquest, no dominion. We seek no indemnities for ourselves, no material compensation for the sacrifices we shall freely make. We are but one of the champions of the rights of mankind. We shall be satisfied when those rights have been made as secure as the faith and the freedom of nations can make them.

Just because we fight without rancor and without selfish object, seeking nothing for ourselves but what we shall wish to share with all free peoples, we shall, I feel confident, conduct our operations as belligerents without passion and ourselves observe with proud punctilio the principles of right and of fair play we profess to be fighting for.

I have said nothing of the governments allied with the Imperial Government of Germany, because they have not made war upon us or challenged us to defend our right and our honor. The Austro-Hungarian Government has, indeed, avowed its unqualified endorsement and acceptance of the reckless and lawless submarine warfare adopted now without disguise by the Imperial German Government, and it has therefore not been possible for this Government to receive Count Tarnowski, the ambassador recently accredited to this Government by the Imperial and Royal Government of Austria-Hungary; but that Government has not actually engaged in warfare against citizens of the United States on the seas, and I take the liberty, for the present at least, of postponing a discussion of our relations with the authorities at Vienna. We enter this war only where we are clearly forced into it, because there are no other means of defending our rights.

It will be all the easier for us to conduct ourselves as belligerents in a high spirit of right and fairness because we act without animus, not in enmity toward a people or with the desire to bring any injury or disadvantage upon them, but only in armed opposition to an irresponsible government which has thrown aside all considerations of humanity and of right and is running amuck. We are, let me say again, the sincere friends of the German people, and shall desire nothing so much as the early reestablishment of intimate relations of mutual advantage between us. However hard it may be for them, for the time being, to believe that this is spoken from our hearts. We have borne with their present Government through all these bitter months because of that friendship, exercising a patience and forbearance which would otherwise have been impossible. We shall, happily, still have an opportunity to prove that friendship in our daily attitude and actions toward the millions of men and women of German birth and native sympathy who live amongst us and share our life, and we shall be proud to prove it toward all who are in fact loyal to their neighbors and to the Government in the hour of test. They are, most of

them, as true and loyal Americans as if they had never known any other fealty or allegiance. They will be prompt to stand with us in rebuking and restraining the few who may be of a different mind and purpose. If there should be disloyalty, it will be dealt with with a firm hand of stern repression; but if it lifts its head at all, it will lift it only here and there and without countenance except from a lawless and malignant few.

It is a distressing and oppressive duty, gentlemen of the Congress, which I have performed in thus addressing you. There are, it may be, many months of fiery trial and sacrifice ahead of us. It is a fearful thing to lead this great peaceful people into war, into the most terrible and disastrous of all wars, civilization itself seeming to be in the balance. But the right is more precious than peace, and we shall fight for the things which we have always carried nearest our hearts—for democracy, for the right of those who submit to authority to have a voice in their own governments, for the rights and liberties of small nations, for a universal dominion of right by such a concert of free peoples as shall bring peace and safety to all nations and make the world itself at last free. To such a task we can dedicate our lives and our fortunes, everything that we are and everything that we have, with the pride of those who know that the day has come when America is privileged to spend her blood and her might for the principles that gave her birth and happiness and the peace which she has treasured. God helping her, she can do no other.

**EXCERPTS FROM REMARKS OF MR. MILLER, REPUBLICAN, OF MINNESOTA, IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES JANUARY 21, 1919**

\* \* \* There is another son of our country, of whom I would speak today, one whose service to this land of ours during the long period of war stands out conspicuous even in these days of greatness and achievement, one who died for his country as resolutely, as nobly as any soldier ever died for the country he loved. I speak of Walter Hines Page, late Ambassador to Great Britain. He was truly a remarkable man, a wonderful man. The smoke of battle must disappear from the earth, the perspective of a distant year when his work shall be better known must come, before the world will know him and measure his deeds.

The Court of St. James has been the most important diplomatic post under the American flag. The line of illustrious men who have represented our country there presents many of the greatest names in our history. In truth, their lives form a large part of the history of our country. Five of these—John Adams, James Monroe, John Quincy Adams, Martin Van Buren, and James Buchanan—later became Presidents of the United States. In the list are also found the names of Rufus King, William Pinkney, Albert Gallatin, John Jay, and Thomas Pinckney, among the most brilliant intellects our Nation has produced. In this list are many of the foremost names in American letters—George Bancroft, James Russell Lowell, Edward Everett, and Charles Francis Adams.

In recent times we find such names as John Hay, Joseph H. Choate, and Whitelaw Reid. Walter Hines Page was the last of this illustrious line and, in my judgment, the greatest, if service is to measure greatness. No other diplomatic representative of our country in all our history ever had as many and as difficult burdens laid upon him. Hardly had he adjusted himself to the duties of his exalted position, acquainting himself with the English people and all branches of their Government, when the Great War like a thunderclap from a clear sky struck Europe. There were more than 50,000 Americans abroad, frantically struggling to escape from the scene of conflict. Letters of credit were valueless and all were in financial straits. Means of transportation were uncertain and often unobtainable. They managed somehow to get to London and there found asylum under the protection of Ambassador Page. Great mobs besieged his home and the American Embassy. He and his staff—in fact, his entire personal and official family—worked night and day during weary weeks and months. The multitude had to be fed, housed, and a passage home secured. Yes, even though passenger ships had nearly ceased to sail, a passage home somehow had to be found. What a motley throng they were! Millionaires, teachers, Negroes, Indians, and cowboys from stranded wild-west shows elbowed and surged in one great American throng. Millionaire and Negro, teacher and cowboy, looked alike to Mr. Page. It was enough that they were Americans, and each received the best Mr. Page could do or give. Many a poor cuss, penniless and stranded, without credit at home or abroad, had his passage home paid by the American Ambassador with no possible hope of return.

But this was only a part of his work. During those whirlwind days, and during all the days for nearly 3 years, the diplomatic relations between America and Great Britain were at fever heat. America was the only great power of the world then not engaged in the great conflict. The fleet of mighty Britain dominated the seas of the world, and the rights of our great neutral country were often jeopardized as Britain fought for her life. Distant as we were from the zone of conflict, and feeling it our duty to be perfectly neutral, we could not and did not appreciate the necessity which England believed made legitimate many acts of hers on the high seas. It is not too much to say, and to say it is not divulging any secret that ought to be hid, there was a time when our relations with Great Britain reached practically an impasse.

\* \* \* I have jogged pretty well over this world, one time and another, and have met in foreign lands many representatives of our country. Among them many stand out in memory for splendid courtesies extended and for the most excellent Americanism they displayed. But Ambassador Page was in a class by himself. Never at home or abroad have I met a man like him.

\* \* \* As Mr. Page was the most perfect American in character and conduct I have ever found in our country's service, so

he was the ablest executive and wisest adviser our country has had in its Diplomatic Service in modern times.

\* \* \* It may be if one caught only a fleeting glimpse of this Ambassador of ours he would be thought homely in form, but no one that knew him ever thought that of him. The bigness of his character and the splendor of his mind were thought of. Like the woman who came from the presence of the great Lincoln, with a pardon for her son in her hand, and amid her happy tears exclaimed, "And they told me he was a homely man."

Mr. Page possessed many of Lincoln's elements of greatness. He was simple in manner, direct in expression, lofty in thought, and filled with human sympathies. To inspire love in one's fellow man one must love that fellow man. And Page loved his fellow men. To be of service was as natural to him as to live. In a very human heart there reposed a lofty soul. In his presence you felt vastly more than your mind interpreted from what he said. He lived thought and feeling and in this way exerted a powerful influence. He personified America as our ideals want America to be.

\* \* \* Mr. Page knew nothing of the intrigue of diplomacy. His method was direct, straightforward, honest. His word was relied upon as soon as it was spoken.

\* \* \* But he knew the end was near. He knew his days were numbered. For months he worked on, looking ahead straight into his open grave. Yet he faltered not, nor did he complain. He felt himself a soldier of his country even unto death. At last that worn-out body could carry the burden no longer, and he took to this couch, saying, "I am tired and must rest." He knew it would be a long, long rest. And his heart yearned for the hills and the valleys of Carolina he so loved when a boy; and they bore him there, quietly and reverently. Those eyes, with a vision death had not yet dimmed, once more saw the clear skies and the sunshine of his native State, the land he loved so well, the hills he climbed when a boy, the old home that was associated with so much that was dear in his life. Then, with the bells of victory ringing throughout the land, with the world saved and again at peace, with the country he loved and served advanced high in grateful thought of mankind, his work ended, he went to sleep.

**EXCERPT FROM ADDRESS OF VISCOUNT GREY OF FALLODON, K. G., AT THE UNVEILING OF THE TABLET TO WALTER HINES PAGE IN THE CHAPTER HOUSE AT WESTMINSTER ABBEY, JULY 3, 1923**

The tablet that is to be unveiled today is in memory of one whose every word and act in great places were inspired by single-minded and earnest desire to make human freedom, as he saw it realized in democracy, prevail among the nations of the world. Walter Hines Page was an example of the truth that the strongest personalities are the outcome not so much of striving for personal success or fame as of patriotism and of faith in an ideal. His patriotism was of the noblest kind; he loved his country both for what it was and for what he believed it could and would do for the benefit of mankind. His perception of the power of the United States, his belief in its democracy, his absolute and never-faltering trust in the will of its people to do great things and good things for the world, were part of his very being. Surely it must be a proud as well as a happy thought for his country to remember that it inspired a faith so high in a mind so keen and pure.

**LIFE AND LETTERS OF WALTER HINES PAGE. (HENDRICK, VOL. 1, P. 397)**

That the world was saved from this calamity is owing largely to the fact that Great Britain had in its Foreign Office a man who was always solving temporary irritations with his eyes constantly fixed upon a great goal, and that the United States had as Ambassador in London a man who had the most exalted view of the mission of his country, who had dedicated his life to the world-wide spread of the American ideal, and who believed that an indispensable part of his work was the maintenance of a sympathetic and helpful cooperation with the English-speaking peoples.

**REPRESENTATIVE ROBERT N. PAGE'S STATEMENT**

[From the Washington Post]

Many patriotic citizens of North Carolina are writing me and wiring me to support the President in his diplomatic controversies with European countries. Many just as patriotic are telling me to support a resolution warning American citizens against taking passage on armed vessels of belligerent countries.

The Constitution vests in the President all diplomatic questions, and I, as one Member of Congress, am willing that he should exercise this prerogative. I do not think that Congress or any other large body of men can successfully negotiate matters of diplomacy with other countries. When the President demanded that Congress pass upon a resolution warning American citizens against taking passage on armed vessels of belligerent nations I suggested the following resolution:

"Whereas the Constitution vests in the President all matters of diplomacy:

"Resolved, That the Senate and House of Representatives in Congress assembled hereby express confidence in the President in the exercise of this prerogative for the protection of the lives and liberties of American citizens and the honor and peace of the Republic."

**SAYS IT SHIFTS RESPONSIBILITY**

The President is not satisfied with an unreserved expression of confidence on the part of Congress, but demands a vote upon the

warning of American citizens to refrain from using armed vessels of belligerent countries, asking that it be voted down. This shifts to the conscience and convictions of Members of Congress a responsibility that the Constitution imposed upon the Executive. Having the responsibility thrust upon me, I claim the right to exercise my own judgment and convictions and not have them dictated by someone else. I do not believe that an American should insist upon the exercise of any abstract right that will jeopardize the peace of his country.

To vote against a resolution of warning, places upon me the responsibility for the death of all Americans who, in absence of such warning, may lose their lives by the destruction of an armed vessel of some one of the warring powers, and perhaps thereby plunge this country into war. I cannot gain the consent of my conscience, much as I would like to gratify the President and meet what seems to be the demands of my constituents, regardless of my own conscientious convictions, to in every matter vote as the President requests, thereby assuming responsibility for the loss of a single American life, or even indirectly stain my hands with his blood.

In this instance I am sure that I am in possession of facts which a partial press has kept the people I represent in ignorance of.

QUOTES SAVIOR'S UTTERANCE

Jesus Christ never uttered a more profound truth than when He declared, "Where your treasure is, there will your heart be also." The loan of \$500,000,000 to England by American capitalists, to say nothing of the profits of munition manufacturers, has destroyed the semblance even of neutrality in the United States and will probably lead us into war. I have no pro-German or pro anything sentiment or inclination other than pro-American. I realize very forcibly my obligation and responsibility to my immediate constituency and to the American people. I will not stultify my conscience or stain my hands with the blood of my countrymen, neither will I do violence to my conscientious conviction of duty, thereby forfeiting my self-respect.

And now while, so far as I am informed, I would have no opposition for renomination in the approaching primary, I desire to announce that I will not be a candidate for the nomination.

I can never express the depth of my gratitude to the Democrats of the Seventh District for their support and friendship. I would not be in any degree worthy of it if I did not maintain my self-respect and intellectual integrity by retiring instead of remaining your Representative without either.

COPY OF PART OF LETTER WRITTEN BY ROBERT N. PAGE TO HIS SISTER-IN-LAW, MISS CORNELIA SHAW, LIBRARIAN OF DAVIDSON COLLEGE

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, D. C., March 13, 1916.

I thank you sincerely for your note, prompted by your love and confidence in me. I can't talk to the public with the same degree of candor that I can you. My action in declining to be a candidate was prompted by a hearty disgust for the insincerity of men in both high and low places. It was not the result of impulse; on the contrary, it was the unavoidable culmination of a tendency on the part of the people to deny a Representative the right to use his brain (if he happened to have one) and demand the blind following of a popular idol. I greatly admire Mr. Wilson and in most things find it easy to agree with him, but I have not forgotten the first commandment; many of my constituents have.

Fourteen years ago I wrote into the bond when my people first sent me here the spending of my physical and mental powers to their limit in their service. I did it gladly, and I have paid it to the last ounce of both—I did not sell them my convictions or my conscience—many of them (by no means all) demanded these. I refused, and that's all there is to it. They wanted a phonograph with power merely to vote as it's told, regardless of conviction or conscience. They do not want any thinking done—merely do what some other tells you to do.

Then, here, men elected to Congress privately in cloak room and office loudly proclaiming their position upon questions, swearing no power could change them—a whisper from the White House—presto change "vote any way you say vote, never thought of doing otherwise." I am happy in full possession of my self-respect, headed for private life, where I can think my own thoughts and dare utter my own convictions.

THE WHITE HOUSE,  
Washington, February 23, 1915.

Hon. ROBERT N. PAGE,  
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. PAGE: May I not thank you very warmly indeed for your letter of February 17?

I hope you know how entirely I respect and honor you. I have been grieved, of course, that you could not support me in such matters as the vote on the ship-purchase bill. The fact that you could not has, however, made me question my own judgment more than it made me question your confidence in me or your loyalty to the party. I do feel very strongly that party government is not possible unless the judgment of individuals can yield to the determinations of party councils, but I have no doubt that that consideration is as prominent in your own mind as in my own and that you do not need to have it recalled.

Pray never think that any false impression will be lodged in my mind as to your motives.

Cordially and sincerely yours,

WOODROW WILSON.

REMARKS BY COLLEAGUES CONCERNING THE SERVICE OF MR. ROBERT N. PAGE IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Dec. 21, 1916, p. 662]

MR. MANN. Mr. Speaker, we are in the House, having finished the consideration of the District of Columbia appropriation bill in committee. I think it is a duty that I owe to the House—and a very pleasant duty—to make a reference to the gentleman who has had charge of the District appropriation bill in the House. I do not recall how long Mr. Page has been a Member of the House of Representatives, nor even how long he has had charge of the District of Columbia appropriation bill, but I do recall that for many years in this House it has been a sincere pleasure to me personally, and I am sure to all the other Members of the House, to meet with the pleasing personality of the gentleman from North Carolina. [Applause.]

I make it a practice, and I have done so for many years, of privately receiving advice, suggestions, and information from Members on the Democratic side, though I do not always give them credit in public. [Laughter.] I have frequently had the honor and the pleasure of seeking the advice of the gentleman from North Carolina. The House has learned to rely very largely upon his judgment and to have the highest regard for his opinion. [Applause.]

We come and go, treating those who are here and dealing with those who are here on terms of equality. No matter how much we may love a Member who goes out, we treat his successor as one of us, on the same plane with all. But to me the one thing that causes me distress as a Member of this House is parting with those Members whom I have learned to love.

The gentleman from North Carolina goes out of the House purely on his own volition. He goes with the respect and the admiration of every Member of this body, and with the sincere regret of us all that he will not be in the next House to give us the benefit and comfort of his courage, indomitable as it is [applause], of his wise opinions, and of his pleasing manner of dealing with all who come into contact with him. [Prolonged applause.]

MR. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 5 minutes.

THE SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MR. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, everyone who is acquainted with the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Page] not only shares the high opinion entertained of him by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Mann] but must be under a deep sense of obligation for the generous manner in which he has expressed it.

Six years ago, when first appointed to the head of the Committee on Appropriations, I was in the somewhat unusual position of being placed over a committee of 14 members of the majority party, only 3 of whom had ever served on that committee. It necessitated careful and patient work to organize the committee properly, and to have the members unfamiliar with its work become acquainted with the many multiplied duties of its members and to enable them to accumulate the information necessary to discharge their duties in a manner satisfactory to the House and to the country. The gentleman from North Carolina had not served upon the committee prior to that time, but with an industry that was unrivaled, with great patience and tact, he not only became thoroughly familiar with the work of the committee, but he also did that much more important thing, he very speedily gained the confidence of the House for his wide knowledge and for the accuracy and the reliability of his statements.

MR. SPEAKER, my experience in the House, now extending over a period of 18 years, leads me to believe that more important than brilliant attainments or great talents is that sincerity of purpose and honesty of statement that make Members of this House have absolute faith in the Member addressing them. [Applause.] Once that confidence is gained it is invaluable, and I have never in my experience known of a Member to do anything or to act in any way to justify the House in withdrawing its confidence. The gentleman from North Carolina has so mastered the details of his work, has so won the confidence of the House, and has exercised such sound judgment in the discharge of his public duties that he has not only relieved me of a very considerable portion of the burdens and duties of my position, but he has made the District of Columbia appropriation bill one that now has the approval not only of the House but of the community.

The most surprising thing I have known in many years has been the universal approval of the press of this city of the District bill as reported and just completed in the committee. The bill was so framed that it aroused but slight antagonism. With the exception of some matters of legislative concern, which the experience and wisdom of the committee led them to believe were desirable to submit to the House, but which Members could properly eliminate by the exercise of their right under the rules, the bill received practically universal commendation in the House. I can only hope that in the future these bills will be received with the same favor, not only here but on the outside. The gentleman from North Carolina has had an intelligent interest in the development and beautifying of the National Capital. He has not been anxious to rush hastily and speedily to the completion of many things that, although desirable, cannot be done too rapidly, but with an intelligent and comprehensive knowledge of the needs of the District of Columbia and the necessities of its government he has so framed the appropriation bills as to give satisfaction to all concerned.

I regret exceedingly that he determined to retire to private life. He has been a loyal supporter in many difficult hours; he has been a safe counselor in troublesome matters; he has been a confidant who consoled; he has been a generous and devoted friend. He has had a successful and brilliant career in the House, and I know I express the hope of all Members that the years after his retirement will be long, happy, and prosperous. [Prolonged applause.]

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I shall not attempt to express my feelings upon this occasion. I cannot trust myself. I can only thank my friends, the leader of the minority [Mr. Mann], the chairman of my committee [Mr. Fitzgerald], and the membership of this House for their very liberal estimate of my service here.

I want to say to my colleagues that I have felt until just now that I should be very happy when I retired to private life, and I hope I shall be; but I cannot forget, nor shall I undertake to forget, that I separate with my colleagues here with very great reluctance, because it means a separation from those whom I have learned to love very dearly. I thank you, my colleagues, for this tribute. [Applause.]

**SUPPORT H. R. 10310 AND HELP COLLECT THE WAR DEBTS—EUROPE MUST BE MADE TO PAY FOR THE LAST WAR BEFORE IT STARTS ANOTHER ONE**

Mr. ELLENBOGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks on the war debts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLENBOGEN. Mr. Speaker, on January 16 I introduced a bill to collect \$12,000,000,000 due us. I believe the time is opportune to demand that foreign debtors resume payment of defaulted installments of the war debts.

We must collect these debts to enable us to pay for public works, feed the unemployed, provide for the needy and the aged, pay the soldiers' bonus, and reduce the national debt.

**BABY BONDS CAN BE REDEEMED BY WAR DEBTS**

Several weeks ago the Congress decided to pay its war debt to the soldiers by voting for immediate payment of the adjusted-service certificate. New or increased taxation to meet this nonrecurring expense connected with payment of these certificates is inadvisable. Instead I suggest that our war debt to our soldiers be paid by insisting on the collection of the war debts due us.

**DEBTORS ARE ABLE TO PAY**

I maintain that England, France, Italy, and other foreign debtors have made sufficient recovery to enable them to make payments to this country. Part of these payments should be sufficient each year to meet the expense of paying this debt to our soldiers, who fought and sacrificed for the benefit of these debtor countries.

**HOOVER MORATORIUM WAS UNWISE**

Since June 15, 1931, when President Hoover unwisely and without authority in law granted a moratorium on interest payments due us semiannually, the debt problem has been neglected and permitted to drift toward cancellation. This moratorium postponed the payment of \$252,566,900 due the United States Government from European nations for 1 year.

This has continued to cost the American taxpayer a quarter billion dollars a year.

The Hoover moratorium expired on June 15, 1932, but has unofficially remained in force indefinitely. The generosity of the United States and its willingness to forego its claims for 1 year was not appreciated by the debtor nations. It served as an excuse for the complete stoppage of all foreign-debt payments to the United States, with one notable exception.

**FINLAND MAINTAINS HONOR**

Finland has regularly made its own payments, whereas all other foreign debtor governments have defaulted since December 1933, and some of them since June 15, 1932.

We have a right at this time to question the sincerity of our former allies in refusing to pay even a small part of the debt they owe us. It is an amazing spectacle, a story of base ingratitude, of repudiation, and of national dishonor.

The ability to forget unpleasant things is as convenient for nations as it is for individuals. From 1914 to 1917 all the nations of Europe were drawn up into two great camps of war. It may have begun as a war for expansion, for new trade outlets, new territories, a larger "place in the sun." But by 1917 it was a war which meant national life for the victor and extinction for the loser.

#### GOVERNMENT LOANS REPLACED PRIVATE LOANS

The sinews of war are dollars. We all know that, and the munitions investigation which is now going on in Washington has exposed the terrific pressure that was being exerted over here for the granting of private loans to the Allies.

When the United States entered the World War in 1917 Government loans took the place of private loans. When the armistice brought a halt to the murdering of millions of men the United States had loaned to its European allies a total of \$7,077,114,750. A colossal sum, and a good place to stop. But we did not stop. For, following the armistice, we loaned the Allies the additional sum of \$3,085,126,000. And today, 17 years after the war, there is still due us, delinquent, unpaid, overdue, and in default, the staggering total of \$12,328,960,509.67.

#### SACRIFICE OF AMERICAN PEOPLE CANNOT BE CALCULATED

Since we are confining our subject right now to war debts, we will not speak of a more important expenditure—the dead and wounded Americans who made the greatest contribution of all, and the countless dollars spent in various ways by the American people for a war 3,000 miles away.

But we can remember this, and we should, despite the fact that the European nations are so eager to forget it: Once we were in the World War, the United States poured into it, without stint, freely, loyally, and enthusiastically, the great stream of its manpower and its wealth.

#### AMERICAN IDEALISM PROVED

If ever the conduct of a nation was idealistic and above reproach, it was the conduct of the American people during the World War. I except, of course, the vile merchants of death—the war profiteers who, like vultures, preyed on the dead. But these were the few—it was the 120,000,000 Americans who believed that this was really a war to end wars.

#### AMERICA REJECTED SPOILS

The best proof of that was the post-armistice period, and the sordid spectacle of the Treaty of Versailles. Alone of all the participants, we did not want a slice of Europe. We had no desire for new colonies, new trade routes, new slices of territory, or spoils of victory.

All we wanted, all we asked, was a repayment of sums due us from those who had borrowed them. We wanted no part of their profits, only what they owed us. We wanted those sums because we needed them. Those loans came from the pockets of the American people. They came from the Liberty loans, each generously oversubscribed by a patriotic people. Each Liberty loan bond is a debt of the United States Government, which it must repay.

#### INGRATITUDE OF DEBTORS DENOUNCED

I am only recalling these facts in order to show the incredible ingratitude of the debtor governments. I am only recalling these facts to show that after we gave of our manpower and of our financial resources to the war, after we saved Belgium, preserved the territorial integrity of France, and perpetuated England's domination over Europe, these foreign governments forgot not only the vast sacrifice which we made for them but also their solemn obligation and national honor.

#### ENGLAND AND FRANCE ARE ABLE TO PAY

On December 15, 1935, the installment of principal and interest due from England amounted to \$117,670,765.05. Does England, which dominates one-fourth of the world and taxes hundreds of millions of people, mean to say that it could not meet a debt payment of \$117,000,000? On that day the amount due from France amounted to \$22,308,312.22. Does the Government of France mean to say that on that date it was unable to pay the installment of \$22,000,000 which had become due? Of course not! The people of England and France are better able to bear this burden than the American people. Europe must be compelled to assume this burden.

#### DEBTS WERE GREATLY REDUCED

Let us not overlook the fact that in settling or funding the war debts our Government has been most generous. The original obligations acquired by the United States when the

loans were made bore interest at 5 percent per annum. The funding agreements provided for payments of a much lower rate of interest.

The total amount of principal and interest due to the various dates on which settlements became effective was \$12,909,000,000. The value of the payments to be made under the debt settlement is \$5,888,000,000. This represents a cancellation of \$6,200,000,000 made by the American Government, or, if you wish, a cancellation of one-half of the debt due at the dates of the various settlements. In justice it should be said that this difference or cancellation is not due to an abatement or cancellation of principal, but is solely due to a reduction in the rate of interest. This reduction will mean heavy losses to our Government, because in many cases the rate of interest we charge is lower than the rate we pay on the public debt incurred in obtaining the funds to lend to these foreign governments.

#### GOLD DEVALUATION REDUCED DEBTS

Another partial cancellation was made in 1934 when we devalued our currency by 41 percent. At that time we canceled 41 percent of the gold value of the debts due us because the debts are due in the devalued dollar currency. This is another concession or cancellation in part which we have voluntarily made to the debtor governments.

I do not mean to say that we should insist on the letter of our contract. But I do say that they should pay as much as they are able to pay, and certainly England, France, Italy, Belgium, Hungary, and Poland, and the other debtor nations, can pay and should pay.

The default in the payments due by the European governments has continued since December 1933. If we permit these defaults to continue much longer, we agree by our silence to the cancellation of the entire debt.

#### DEBTORS THREATEN PEACE OF EUROPE

These defaulters are again disturbing the peace of the world. Their diplomacy and selfishness is calculated to plunge the world into another needless and useless war that will again deluge Europe in blood and tears.

We must say to these nations whose contract is a worthless scrap of paper that they must pay for the last war before they start another. When Europe was in the throes of an economic depression, we were willing to wait; but now, when these debtors are spending millions for armaments, when, instead of paying their honest debts, they are wasting their resources on implements of war, we must cease our leniency and demand prompt payment.

I have therefore introduced H. R. 10310, creating a Debt Commission to negotiate for the prompt resumption of debt payments due us.

#### PARTIAL ABATEMENT OF INTEREST

In view of the urgency for prompt payment we are willing to make further concessions. The success of the various abatement acts in providing large payments of delinquent taxes leads us to believe that abatement of a part of delinquent interest should be sufficient incentive to the debtor nations to make payments. We are willing to do this, provided they make arrangements for the payment of the entire principal obligation before December 1937.

#### ACCEPTING PAYMENTS IN DEFENSE EQUIPMENT

If these European debtors cannot pay us in cash they can pay us in kind. Instead of our Government spending millions of dollars from current revenues for the purchase of ships, airplanes, and other equipment necessary for national defense, we can ask the debtor nations to transfer to us ships, airplanes, and other equipment as part payment of the debts. Not only will we save the cost of the appropriation for such equipment by such action but we will be preserving the peace of Europe by thus reducing the armaments of these war-anxious nations.

#### TRANSFER OF AMERICAN INVESTMENTS HELD BY NATIONALS OF DEBTOR COUNTRIES

At the present time citizens of foreign countries own seven and one-half billion dollars' worth of American stocks, bonds, mortgages, and other forms of investment. In other words, American industry and American enterprise, in that great

sum, are turning over their profits to these foreign investors. I see no reason why a substantial part of these investments cannot be turned over by the countries whose citizens hold these investments to us in partial payment of these debts. This action would not disturb trade markets or affect trade balances. It is a practical method and a sound one.

#### RECOVERY WOULD BE PROMOTED

When you and I think of those billions of dollars, we also wonder what it could do for our distressed country today. Hundreds of thousands of unemployed would be put to work. Idle wheels of industry would start revolving. Thousands of homes would be built. Millions in agricultural produce would be bought. The soldiers' bonus baby bonds would be redeemed without imposing new taxes.

I submit that to get back any part of this \$12,000,000,000 debt is worth all possible effort which we can make. I hope I will have your support.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that my colleagues will support and that the Congress will pass H. R. 10310.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Horne, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10464) making appropriations to provide urgent supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, and for prior fiscal years, and for other purposes, numbered 12, 24, 25, 33, and 62.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after the reading of the Journal and disposition of matters on the Speaker's table, I may address the House for 10 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 seconds at this time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to state that the subject on which I shall speak tomorrow, after devoting 2 or 3 minutes, not more than that, to answering some remarks of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] about myself upon this floor, will be a discussion of the so-called "red" rider.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, following the speech of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SISSON], I may address the House for 10 minutes.

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

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I imagine that the request of the gentleman from Texas, judging from the notice of the character of the speech to be made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SISSON], is a reasonable request. I shall not object to his request, but I do desire to state that it is the purpose of the organization of the House to take up at the earliest possible moment all of the unfinished appropriation bills and a few other essential measures, with the idea that we may conclude as speedily as possible the deliberations of this session of Congress and adjourn sine die. [Applause.] The War Department appropriation bill is the order of business, and I imagine the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. PARKS], who has charge of that bill, has a great number of requests for time. I think he has kindly agreed to limit general debate on that bill in order that we may pass it by Thursday or Friday of this week. I, therefore, trust that no further requests will be made for unanimous consent to speak except in general debate.

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

Mr. BANKHEAD. I am not objecting to the gentleman's request.

Mr. BLANTON. I know, but will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. I would say to my friend the majority leader that, for one, I am helping him. To do that I missed all my Christmas family reunions in Texas. I came up here to Washington in December and have been busily engaged in holding hearings on appropriation bills to expedite the program of our majority leader.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I appreciate that. I am not objecting to the gentleman's request.

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

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I do not intend to ask unanimous consent to speak, but the remarks of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SISSON] may compel it tomorrow. He has announced that he will speak on "red" chasing, or something of the kind. Remarks have been made lately which tend to impugn the motives of Members of the House, and I am serving notice now, having refrained from speaking on the floor before, that I shall ask for time should the gentleman from New York in his remarks enter the field of personalities.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is, is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

#### A NATIONAL LOTTERY—SHALL WE USE IT?

Mr. MONAGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a radio address delivered by my colleague the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KENNEY].

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KENNEY] on February 8, 1936:

Nineteen hundred and twenty-nine.

The crash.

Result: An unbalanced Budget for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1930. The Budget has been out of balance ever since.

Nevertheless, the Budget of ordinary expenses has been balanced during the administration of President Roosevelt. The extraordinary expenses made necessary by the national economic collapse are alone responsible for the recurring deficits.

Throughout, the credit of the Federal Government has weathered all financial storms. Receipts are mounting to offset expenditures. Eventually we shall emerge masters of our debt.

But, we must be cautious. It was the last straw that broke the camel's back. We have been bearing down heavily on the taxpayer. He can stand so much and no more. Right now he is carrying a load which added to might destroy him and us with him. Still we must have more revenue if we are to meet our bills.

There is a way to get this revenue, without inflation, without taxation.

A national lottery, available for any worthy purpose, would go far to balance the shifting Budget.

In his message to Congress President Roosevelt estimated that the Federal income would be sufficient for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937, for all activities except work-relief items. But we have still to deal with our work-relief problem. One billion one hundred and three million dollars will be available for recovery and relief purposes out of previous emergency appropriations, as is pointed out in the President's message. Another billion can be garnered from the idle funds and the proceeds of authorized debentures of various Government lending agencies. The President has already taken steps to bring these funds into use. If two billions or less will serve for relief and recovery purposes for the fiscal year ending 1937, as is believed, since demands for relief are diminishing, the funds will be available.

But that is not all. To the expenditures so far mentioned we must add an expense of \$500,000,000 if we are to have a farm program to aid the farmers of the country. In addition, we shall need another \$100,000,000 each year for the next 9 years for bonus payments. To meet this outlay we shall have to raise at least \$600,000,000 to keep our Budget near balance and the national debt in check.

There is at the moment in Congress a bill introduced by me providing for the establishment of a national lottery to be conducted under the auspices of the Federal Government to raise a sum not exceeding \$1,000,000,000 in any one year, the tickets to be sold at

the post offices throughout the country. The passage of this bill would tap a source of treasure which could, it is believed, provide the needed revenue without crushing our millions of taxpayers who now stagger under triple loads of Federal, State, and local taxes.

As for the billion dollars, take heed:

Under date of August 23, 1934, in a release issued by Horace J. Donnelly, Esq., former Solicitor of the Post Office Department, this statement appeared:

"During the past 2 years no less than a billion dollars have been kept from going out of this country in support of foreign lotteries."

Altogether, according to estimates, between three and six billions are spent by the American people on lotteries, many of them dishonest, foreign and domestic. Operators of these lotteries do not confine their activities to the large cities, but mult the people everywhere. Our laws prohibit, but they do not prevent, participation in lotteries. The average citizen is ever ready to spend a small sum of money for a chance to better his condition. He cannot do so under the law, yet he does so.

New schemes of lotteries, both foreign and domestic, are springing up daily to supplement the innumerable rackets, numbers, policy, and other forms of games of chance which are always with us to fleece the great masses of our population.

And be it remembered that the moneys now spent for lotteries keep outside the pale of our economic structure. They do not find their way to the banks. They go out of the country or are hoarded in safes by the racketeers away from economic circulation. The only way you can harness these moneys for economic uses is for the Government to intervene with a legal outlet for their flow into the Government Treasury.

Down in the Isthmus of Panama, where there is a population of 472,468, exclusive of the occupants of the Canal Zone, the gross receipts of its Government lottery are \$90,000 a week. The annual intake figures \$4,680,000. That averages just about \$10 per person per year. Here we now have a population of 127,000,000 people. If we could do as well as Panama we could command gross lottery receipts amounting to \$1,270,000,000. But with our resources could we not do twice as well as Panama? If so, we would have gross receipts of \$2,540,000,000, of which 40 percent, or one billion, could go into the Federal Treasury.

This does not mean that every person in the country will have to contribute his per-capita share. The lottery is voluntary. None needs to buy a ticket except he wills. The curse of direct compulsory taxes is lifted. The income-tax payer would welcome it. Hosts of our citizens who never paid income or real-estate taxes would be happy to participate. The average would be worked out without hardship to anyone.

Now, then, shall we use the lottery?

So far as I am concerned, I serve notice on the Congress that I shall hesitate to vote for any new tax plan whatever unless and until there shall be enacted into law a bill which shall bring into the Treasury funds in lieu of taxes to be derived from a governmentally operated lottery.

These are extraordinary times, requiring extraordinary governmental expenditures. To discharge our rehabilitation expenses, staggering in their proportions and brought about not by choice but through crucial necessity, we are called upon to provide gigantic funds not readily available from ordinary sources.

In such times it is well to look into the history books for guidance. If we do so we shall find that small contributions from our citizens available to our Government in national crises have invariably rescued us.

During the Revolutionary War when funds were scarce and hard to get and insufficient from ordinary sources to carry on the war, George Washington, father of our country, fostered the lottery as a means to the end that we might become a free and independent people. Washington prevailed when his recommendation was adopted by the Continental Congress. In the Journals of Congress under date of Friday, November 1, 1776, is found the following resolution:

"Resolved, That a sum of money be raised by way of a lottery for defraying the expenses of the next campaign, the lottery to be drawn in the city of Philadelphia."

When the war was won, Alexander Hamilton, the first Secretary of the Treasury, declared that having gained our political independence we should forthwith establish our economic independence. He contributed to the latter by proposing two courses: First, to instruct our people in manufactures; and, second, to pass effective Federal legislation. It was his objective to supply the domestic market with the aid of a protective tariff and to follow through with a bid for world trade.

To accomplish his objective he turned to my State and to the neighborhood where live the good people I have the honor of representing in Congress. Selecting the northern part of New Jersey for the great industrial community of our country, he caused a corporation to be formed under an act of the State of New Jersey to carry on industrial enterprises in which he interested men of importance of that time. This company, chartered as the "Society for Establishing Useful Manufactures", is still in existence.

In writing of his great plan, Hamilton had this to say:

"When application shall be made for an act of incorporation it ought to include a request that provision may be made for incorporating the inhabitants of the district within a certain defined limit which will be chosen by the company as the principal seat of their factories, and a further request that the company may have permission to institute a lottery or lotteries in each year for a term of 5 years for a sum or sums not exceeding in 1 year \$100,000. The State of New Jersey, if duly sensible of its interest in the measure, will not refuse encouragement of this nature. \* \* \*

"The lottery will answer two purposes: It will give a temporary command of money, and the profit arising from it will go toward indemnifying for first unproductive efforts."

Thus wrote Alexander Hamilton of the efficacy of the lottery.

Meanwhile, the First Congress under the Constitution was called into session in 1789. But the new Nation's legislative body had no quarters of its own. In the public dilemma the young metropolis of New York invited the Congress to assemble in its city hall to enact laws for the Nation. So that the building might be suitable in arrangements and appointments, the municipality remodeled and repaired it. The Congress accepted the hospitality of New York and met there for the first time.

But the city incurred a large deficit, as money was then reckoned in America, £13,000, which was beyond the power of the city treasury to pay. So the city laid its problem before the State legislature, asking permission to conduct a lottery to meet this obligation. The lottery was held by the city pursuant to chapter 8 of the laws of 1790 of the State of New York, was a quick success, and the city paid its bill.

When the Ways and Means Committee of the House meets next week to consider a new tax plan, the members of the committee will be reminded by me, if given the opportunity, that the lottery also furnished the funds for the first public buildings erected in the city of Washington, now the District of Columbia. The lottery was conducted by the city pursuant to authority granted by the Congress. It was a solution to its problem when the city and the Capitol were being established. That was in 1795. Washington was President. John Adams was Secretary of State. At the dedication of the building November 22, 1800, John Adams, who was then President, in the course of his address said:

"May this territory be the residence of virtue and happiness. In this city may that piety and virtue, that wisdom and magnanimity, that constancy and self-government which adorned the great character whose name it bears be forever held in veneration. Here and throughout our country may simple manners, pure morals, and true religion flourish forever."

Nowhere have I read of the self-respecting, sturdy American patriots of that time censuring the Congress because it invited revenue by citizens' contributions made in the form of lottery participation, although then, as now, the need was felt for eliminating and placing a ban on private lotteries, rackets, and the many crooked games of chance.

Shall we use the lottery?

Other countries have recourse to the lottery. It is in vogue under every form of government. It is found in the Kingdom of Italy, the Republic of France, the Irish Free State, Germany, Soviet Russia, Holland, Sweden, Australia, Turkey, Argentina, and many more.

From a high authority in the Italian Government is this endorsement of the lottery:

"I want to confirm to you that we have had a national lottery in operation since the organization of the Kingdom. It is conducted with weekly extractions in the 12 most important cities."

"The system in question has had no bad results on the general welfare of the people but has offered, on the contrary, a healthy method of contentment and happiness, with the possibility of drawing a fortune, especially on the part of the people of modest means. The system is under the strictest control of the Government, and since its operation its functioning has been most regular and efficient."

From the German Government I have received this communication:

"For many years legalized lotteries have been conducted in various German states under the auspices of the respective governments.

"As to the effect of these lotteries upon the citizenry, I can unhesitatingly state that they have been adding to the contentment of a large part of the population. Thus their reaction upon the state of mind of the individual citizen has been a favorable one."

From Turkey this has come to me:

"I may say that the Turkish lottery has had no bad effects whatever upon the general welfare of Turkish people and has in no way increased crimes or misdeemeanor."

"On the contrary, the lottery, which is conducted for the promotion of aviation, the purchase of planes, and the training of pilots, has been beneficial in arousing public interest in the cause which it supports."

Shall we use the lottery?

Since our people, as is obvious, have been, and still are, contributing vast sums to give vent to their speculative urge and unconsciously but in reality are pouring millions of money abroad, and are spending billions at home to keep alive dishonest, unscrupulous rackets and the forces of organized crime, can we do better than to give them a self-respecting and wholesome chance to participate in aid of our country in a national lottery conducted under Government auspices?

Shall we use the national lottery?

Tell your Congressmen and Senators.

Petition them.

#### POWER TRUST PROPAGANDA AND THE WICHITA FALLS, TEX., MUNICIPAL LIGHT PLANT ELECTION

Mr. MCFARLANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a radio address I delivered over a national hook-up last Friday evening.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCFARLANE. Mr. Speaker, on Friday evening, February 7, from 7:45 to 8, I was kindly granted permission to use the National Broadcasting Co.'s facilities to talk on the power question. Under permission given to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a copy of the speech delivered.

It has snowed about 15 inches here in Washington today, and the weatherman promises more snow for tomorrow. Weather like this requires plenty of heat and power—so if you will just stay with me for a few minutes, I want to discuss the power question and some of the many difficulties we are experienced in trying to secure for you lower utility rates.

You are familiar with the Walsh resolution, under which the Federal Trade Commission the past 7 years has carefully investigated the power interests of the Nation. I wish it were possible for each one of you to read the nearly 100 volumes, comprising thousands of pages, contained in the testimony taken by this committee, and especially their summary and recommendations to the Congress as a result of their thorough investigation.

#### "WRITE-UPS"

No doubt you have followed some of this testimony in the press as it was given. If you have, you will recall how the power-company employees' testimony, and particularly some of their records, make startling disclosures. For these records showed a write-up and inflation for the 18 top holding companies totaling \$273,420,165, for the sub holding companies \$353,370,035, for the operating companies \$864,231,623, making a total write-up of \$1,491,021,823, and these fictitious increased values were added by these companies based on no more than their optimistic judgment of the value of the property being unified or as the result of so-called "horseback" appraisals based on a superficial inspection of the property by their officials, without any money or property being added to the assets of the company.

Let me name some of these leading companies and the amount of their write-ups.

Electric Bond & Share and affiliates, \$352,243,898; Cities Service and their subsidiaries, \$262,110,708; Central Public Service and subsidiaries, \$252,462,118; South Eastern Power & Light Co. and subsidiaries, \$122,603,437; Middle West Utilities and subsidiaries, \$111,072,732. Yet these companies strenuously deny such write-ups, until the facts were disclosed by the Commission.

These hearings are full of startling disclosures as to the operations of the power interest and how they have been able to control legislation—State and National—to continue their operations of high-rate structures Nation-wide without serious interference.

#### BRIEFLY PUBLIC OPINION

The records disclosed how the power companies were carefully organized Nation-wide, and while they had a national monopoly with little if any competition, to bribe public opinion they have spent annually from \$25,000,000 to \$30,000,000 in advertising in the newspapers throughout the Nation. The hearings show how completely their lobbies have been able to control legislation effecting the utilities Nation-wide and have been able to practically defeat all State legislation, providing adequate regulation of the utilities. The hearings further show that State regulation, because of court decisions, has practically broken down any chance of adequate rate regulation.

#### POWER TRUST OPPOSES WHEELER-RAYBURN BILL

These voluminous hearings of the Federal Trade Commission submitted to this administration, who promptly, in keeping with the platform pledges, began an earnest consideration of legislation to curb these evils. You remember reading daily the results of the battle waged by this administration and how finally we successfully enacted into a law the Wheeler-Rayburn bill, known as the Public Utility Act of 1935. This act was designed to adequately regulate these holding companies, operating in interstate commerce. The power interests who have in the past bitterly opposed State regulation, came to Washington in a body and opposed the Federal regulation, saying that they wanted all matters left with the State, knowing full well that the States could not force adequate regulation.

#### POWER TRUST OPPOSES ALL REGULATION

The power interests have likewise opposed any and all adequate regulation of any kind and character. They opposed, before the Senate, the resolution calling for the investigation made by the Federal Trade Commission. The Electric Bond & Share Co. officials refused to testify on material points and refused to furnish their books and records for the committee, and were finally forced to submit same after decisions were rendered by the Federal courts. And now since the Utility Act has finally been written into the law, we find these same holding companies still opposing same and refusing to register and to give information as required under the law. Registration of these holding companies was required by October 1, 1935.

#### HOLDING COMPANIES REFUSE TO REGISTER

The Electric Bond & Share and others not having filed by the last of November, the Government was forced to file suit to require compliance. When the lobby-investigating committees of the House and the Senate began calling the officials of the power

company to testify as to their lobbying activities, the Government had trouble in requiring their attendants to testify.

POWER TRUST BLOCKS P. W. A. PROJECTS

When the Government began to further assist the overburdened people of the Nation in securing lower utility rates through the Public Works program of construction of municipal light plants, we again find the power interests through injunction suits and through every other possible way to thwart the construction of municipal light plants under Government supervision. For instance, I called to the attention of the Congress on April 29, 1935, how completely the power interests had been able to block the P. W. A. power program. In my remarks I pointed out that out of several hundred power-plant applications filed that very few plants had been constructed because of the opposition of the power interests.

THE GOLD DUST TWINS IN TEXAS

Let me refer to the power situation in my own district, which is a fair example of how this and similar companies have functioned Nation-wide. The Electric Bond & Share Co., I believe the largest power holding company of the group, own and operate both subsidiaries that service my district and a large part of Texas—the Texas Electric Service Co. and the Texas Power & Light Co. These two companies, "the Gold Dust Twins", we call them, were acquired about 20 years ago by one of their subsidiaries, the American Power & Light Co., for less than \$7,000,000. These two companies are now valued for rate-making purposes for more than \$150,000,000. They actually paid \$2,390,000 for the Texas Power & Light Co. and in turn issued common and preferred securities totaling ten and one-half million dollars; the Texas Electric Service Co., costing a similar amount, made a similar immediate inflation. These two subsidiaries, like others, pay all real profits to the holding company. The 5 or 6 percent interest on the preferred stock, if paid, is all that goes to the real owners. We find these properties, like most all others, have paid handsome fees to their holding company year after year for supervision, construction, and other useless contracts which which the holding companies milk the operating companies.

ELECTRIC BOND & SHARE CO. FORCED TO PRODUCE RECORDS

In 1931 the Texas Power & Light Co. paid the Electric Bond & Share \$248,862.60 for such so-called fees and services. Similar amounts were paid by the Texas Electric Service Co. It will be remembered that high officials of the Electric Bond & Share Co. testified before the Federal Trade Commission on their honor that such contractual fees just about covered the costs of the services rendered and when the commission requested their books to check their records they refused to furnish them until the Federal courts forced them to.

RECORDS SHOW ENORMOUS PROFITS

When the Electric Bond & Share was forced to furnish their records, instead of making only a nominal profit the Federal Trade Commission discovered that over a term of more than 20 years this company had been making a substantial part of their income through such various fees and through such contract fees, had collected over \$51,000,000, and had averaged making more than 100 percent profit annually from their subsidiaries on the contractual services furnished.

How do these exorbitant fees affect the local operating companies? Let me illustrate. The Texas Electric Service Co., the last year's records available, 1932, shows that out of a profit of \$1,740,000, that they sent about \$1,350,000 to the Electric Bond & Share and their intermediate holding companies for these services. Thus the poor preferred stockholders, the real owners of the operating company, received less than \$300,000, practically all the common stock being owned by the Electric Bond & Share.

A similar distribution of the earnings of the Texas Power & Light Co. has been made to the Electric Bond & Share.

MUNICIPAL LIGHT-PLANT RATES LOWER

The Federal Trade Commission hearings clearly show that the rates under municipally owned light plants are much lower than those under private companies for similar services rendered.

You would naturally think with such an elaborate set-up the private power companies would be able to furnish more power for less money, but such is not the case.

POWER TRUST OPPOSES LIGHT-PLANT ELECTION

Again let me refer to how the Electric Bond & Share Co. has tried to defeat the construction of the municipal light plant at Wichita Falls, Tex.

An election is being held at Wichita Falls tomorrow to decide whether or not the people want to accept a P. W. A. loan with which to build their municipal light plant, this city being forced to pay the highest light rates of any city its size in Texas. The Texas Electric Service Co. has spent money like "wild Indians" in every way possible to try to defeat this election. They have spent large sums through newspaper advertising, through radio broadcasting, through hiring personal workers, and in every way possible have spent money recklessly to defeat this worthy Government project that will insure those people lower electric-light rates. In the last election, held December 11, 1935, they were very reckless in their public statements concerning the light-plant controversy. They have been even more reckless in their public statements in this campaign.

For example, their so-called citizens taxpayers committee continues to advertise an expenditure of more than \$200,000 in commissions and fees to machinery salesmen, engineers, legal fees, etc. They know this project, like all other projects, will be constructed

under supervision of the Government authorities, and that no scandal of any kind has ever been attached to the construction of such projects. They even charge the city council will receive \$25,000 when they know, under the laws of Texas and the city charter, that such a thing is impossible. They also advertise that many Government loans for municipal light plants have been turned down, including in the list of towns is the name of Marshall, Mo. They state the citizens of this community voted down a municipal light plant. The reverse is true. Marshall, Mo., has recently approved the construction of their municipal light plant, and the P. W. A. loan and grant is still in effect.

Devils Lake, N. Dak., a P. W. A. loan and grant is still in effect, and the power company has filed an injunction suit.

Columbia, Tenn., the loan and grant for a municipal light plant is still in effect.

They mention several other cities that for one reason or another have withdrawn or turned down their application for a municipal light plant. However, they failed to mention the large number of cities that have recently approved elections for municipal light plants, as shown from the records of the P. W. A. authorities here in Washington. The following cities have held elections, approving the construction of a municipal light plant from November 5, 1935, to January 23, 1936:

Waynesboro, Ga.; Forsyth, Ga.; Blissfield, Mich.; Statham, Ga.; White Cloud, Mich.; Zeeland, Mich.; Eveleth, Minn.; Starkville, Miss.; Marshall, Mo.; and Brookland, Tex.

It is well known that it costs less than 1 cent per kilowatt-hour to generate electric current. Whatever is charged above that amount goes to retire plant or other indebtedness.

For a city the size of Wichita Falls on their high rates the power company is annually collecting more than \$1,000,000, most of which is siphoned out of the city to New York never to return.

A municipally owned utility pays better wages, employs more people, and keeps all of the citizens' money at home to help build a bigger and better city. It seems that in view of the splendid successful record made by the more than 3,500 municipally owned light plants operating over a long period of time throughout the Nation that this is ample proof of the soundness of the proposition and what municipal ownership has done and will do for any community which undertakes it.

In conclusion, my friends, particularly you at Wichita Falls, let me say I urge you all to vote on tomorrow for the construction of this municipal light plant; this will guarantee to you lower light rates, and it is the only way you or any other city can be assured of receiving permanent lower rates.

Good night.

A MILLION AND A HALF ALIENS ON RELIEF COST UNITED STATES \$500,000,000 A YEAR

MR. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday's papers carried a very interesting statement by our colleague from Texas, Mr. Dies. I ask unanimous consent to put it in the RECORD.

THE SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a statement of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Dies], which appeared in a newspaper on yesterday. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The following is the statement of Hon. MARTIN DIES, and the headlines under which it appeared in the Washington Herald, Sunday, February 9, 1936:

A MILLION AND A HALF ALIENS ON RELIEF COST UNITED STATES \$500,000,000 A YEAR—DIES—WHILE EUROPEAN NATIONS EJECT ALL JOBLESS FOREIGNERS, OUR LABOR DEPARTMENT NOW "Coddles THEM"

By MARTIN DIES, Congressman from Texas

While we have a million and a half aliens on relief, at a cost of half a billion dollars a year, the average citizen is under the impression that the dangers of alien invasion are past.

It is not true. There are no quotas for immigrants from this hemisphere. Mexicans can come in by the hundreds of thousands. Europeans can go to Canada for a short time, then enter from there.

Thousands enter by shipping as sailors and deserting. Since ship lines are fined for such desertions, the inclination is not to report these. Finally, there are organized gangs who smuggle aliens, provide papers, and even jobs on arrival.

While we face a gigantic unemployment problem, the Department of Labor policy has been to coddle aliens. Criminal aliens have been allowed to remain. Radicals and communists have been admitted. Aliens are given relief on the same basis as citizens. And bills are being prepared to give the Secretary of Labor discretion to relax our immigration laws—at precisely the time when they should be tightened.

NEWCOMERS CROWD CITIZENS OUT OF JOBS

No; the alien invasion continues. And these newcomers, glad to break American wage standards, continue to crowd American citizens out of jobs.

Few realize that there are now some 2,500,000 aliens, mostly Mexicans, in our Southwest. Largely because of this, about an equal number of American citizens are on relief there.

Mexicans will work for less; every Mexican at work within our borders means an unemployed citizen.

Fifteen million dollars a month is the relief bill of Texas, Arizona, New Mexico, and California. What a subsidy to pay in order that

Mexicans may earn American dollars to send back home, while tax burdens force American homes under the hammer, and our citizens are forced into bread lines.

Representative Kent H. Redwine, of California, declares that the cost to Los Angeles County alone of unemployed and unemployable aliens is \$6,000,000 a year; and he adds that "3,000 Mexicans are being kept on charity rolls only 5 miles north of the border of their own country."

The magazine *Today* found 3,000 Mexicans on relief in Imperial Valley alone. In Kern County, Calif., there are twice as many Mexicans as all other nationalities, and almost all aliens. In 1933 the California Joint Immigration Commission found 1,000,000 Mexicans living in that State.

It has cost the Government \$400,000 to support 2,500 Mexicans in Ray, the Miami-Globe district, and Superior, Ariz., since mines there closed permanently in 1932. They could have been deported for \$5 a head, or \$12,500.

During the depression of 1921 the Harding administration sent 6,000 Mexicans home from this district and 40,000 from Arizona as a whole. Now, with conditions 10 times as bad, the Government taxes the people of the State to carry this unwanted alien burden.

Half of all relief in Arizona goes to Mexicans. In Laredo, Tex., three-quarters of those on relief were Mexicans.

Mexico has a population of 16,000,000. More than 2,000,000 Mexicans get their living in dollars—in jobs or on relief. No wonder President Cardenas could boast, "No hay depresion en Mexico."

#### CONDITIONS PREVAIL IN OTHER CENTERS

Similar relief conditions prevail elsewhere, though not always in the same degree.

Seventy thousand aliens are on relief in Massachusetts; 20 cents of every Cleveland relief dollar goes to foreigners; Illinois has 300,000 aliens on relief; Los Angeles, 50,000; 27 percent of San Diego relief checks go to noncitizens, while they take one-quarter of the New York City relief funds.

On the country relief rolls as a whole one out of seven is an alien.

There is talk of being fair to aliens. We should be fair first to our own citizens—the taxpayers, the employed, the unemployed. Other nations practice "enlightened self-interest" in this matter, and their gain has been our loss.

In Europe unemployment shrank by 8,000,000 last year.

There are today 50 percent more persons out of work in the United States than in all of Europe.

As noted in the previous article, while we give haven to 8,000,000 aliens—supporting them in jobs or on relief—8,000,000 employable Americans are jobless.

And in remarkable degree it appears that European nations have recovered and brought about reemployment in proportion as we have taken over their surplus populations.

Figures from the International Labor Office in Geneva covering the year 1934 show:

Germany reduced unemployment by 671,897 that year, and she has sent us 665,000 immigrants since the armistice.

England put 188,614 back to work that year; 171,801 of her citizens had come here since the war.

Italy's relief rolls' reduction was 238,235, and of her crowded population 250,000 came to our shores in a decade.

These aliens write home joyfully declaring that they are better off here on relief than they ever were at home at hard work. However, in large numbers, they do not express content, but complaint, to the Americans who hand out the bounty over here.

In February of last year there were 14 demonstrations for more relief in New York and Chicago alone for which the police said Communists were responsible. In six of these aliens were arrested. At every important relief office in the country there have been similar organized demands by aliens at one time or another.

If we propose firm, fair dealing regarding aliens, we are accused of intolerance and racial prejudice.

#### AMERICA ASYLUM FOR ALL WORLD

And yet there is no other country in the world today which allows foreigners in any numbers to hold jobs while its own citizens are unemployed. Point out what other countries do, and one is told that America should be an asylum for the peoples of all the world. It has been. And that is the chief cause of our present unemployment.

If you are to enter Great Britain for more than a visit, a permit must be issued to your employer, and will not be issued unless he can show no British subject is available for the particular position to be filled. Britain's alien population is 100,000, half of what it was before the war.

In the last few years France has deported 4,000,000 aliens to make room for her own citizens at jobs. She doubled the tax on persons staying over 2 months. Refusal of permits and expulsions are becoming more frequent.

#### REGULATIONS RIGID IN OTHER COUNTRIES

Germany generally refuses work permits to foreigners, and depots destitute aliens. Switzerland allows aliens to work there only during the short tourist season. Belgium's regulations are most rigid.

Mexican laws require aliens coming to work there to invest 20,000 pesos in industry or agriculture, or to show such outside income as to insure their not becoming charges of the state.

Regulations are such that 75,000 Americans have had to give up Mexican jobs. Chinese, Negroes, Malaysians, Hindus, Soviet citi-

zens, gypsies, clergymen, doctors, and professional men are excluded. And yet 1,300,000 Mexicans have come legally into this country in 35 years, and another 500,000 have entered illegally.

That is the viewpoint on the alien question abroad. Obsessed by sentimental weakness, blinded by alien propaganda, we permit alien hordes to pour into our industries, usurping the jobs of Americans. Or we support them permanently on relief.

Our alien population, in proportion to total population, is 40 times that of Great Britain, 90 times that of Germany, 100 times that of Mexico.

It is time for us to think as Americans, about Americans. Must we forever carry the loads of all other peoples?

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD referring to the resignation of Mr. F. G. Awalt from the Treasury Department, and to include therein his letter of resignation, a letter from the President, a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, and a letter from the Comptroller relating to Mr. Awalt.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to say just a few words about my good friend F. G. Awalt, who on February 15 next is severing his connection with the Treasury Department, where he has served with great ability for the past 16 years under five Secretaries of the Treasury. He has been a most capable advisor to our Committee on Banking and Currency. Mr. Awalt is returning to the private practice of the law. I know he will be missed at the Treasury Department, and at this time feel it entirely proper to place in the RECORD copies of the letters he has received from the President, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Comptroller of the Currency in response to his formal letter of resignation, a copy of which I also include in the following:

JANUARY 15, 1936.

The Honorable the PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I have this day submitted to the Secretary of the Treasury my resignation as First Deputy Comptroller of the Currency and Counsel to the Comptroller to take effect February 15, 1936. It is my intention to reenter the private practice of law.

I cannot refrain from again expressing to you my great admiration of your courage and leadership during the dark days surrounding the banking holiday, when I had the honor of serving under you as Acting Comptroller of the Currency.

Faithfully yours,

F. G. AWALT,

Deputy Comptroller and Counsel.

JANUARY 31, 1936.

Mr. F. G. AWALT,

Deputy Comptroller and Counsel, Treasury Department:

MY DEAR MR. AWALT: I learn with regret that you are about to leave the Government service after so many years of able and devoted work in responsible positions in the Treasury Department.

Naturally I am best acquainted with the remarkably wise and competent manner in which you carried on the duties of Acting Comptroller in the heart of the banking crisis in the early days of my administration and with the fine assistance that you have given to Secretaries Woodin and Morgenthau and to Comptroller O'Connor since then. For this great service you deserve and you have my most sincere gratitude and you deserve also the gratitude of the Nation.

It has been encouraging to me to be able to rely on your continued loyal support and you have my good wishes as you leave the public service with a clear record of good work well done.

Sincerely,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

JANUARY 30, 1936.

Mr. F. G. AWALT,

Deputy Comptroller and Counsel, Treasury Department:

MY DEAR MR. AWALT: Since you have expressed to me so firmly your fixed desire to reenter the private practice of law I am reluctantly accepting your resignation as Deputy Comptroller of the Currency and Counsel, to be effective on February 15, 1936.

Your record of 16 years of able and loyal service in the Treasury Department is an enviable one. You have crowned it with work of the heaviest responsibility in the Comptroller's office in one of the most difficult periods that office has ever seen; and in every crisis, every duty, and every responsibility you have acquitted yourself nobly.

I have valued your advice and support, and I regret deeply your leaving. My heartiest good wishes go with you.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY MORGENTHAU, Jr.,  
Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. F. G. AWALT,  
*Deputy Comptroller.*

DEAR FLOYD: Your letter addressed to me stating you desire to return to private practice is before me.

Permit me to express my appreciation of the fine service rendered as First Deputy Comptroller in a period of stress which can never be forgotten. Your strict application to duty, your long training in the Comptroller's office perfectly fitted you for the task you performed so well. It is a pleasure, indeed, to look back for almost 3 years and recall that not a single incident marred our official relations or strained a friendship I value so highly. Into the broader field of the law you carry my best wishes.

The legal profession gains a thoroughly grounded expert in banking law, and your industry and application will insure your continued success.

I have transmitted your letter to the Secretary.

Cordially yours,

J. F. T. O'CONNOR, *Comptroller.*

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I should like to have unanimous consent to ask the majority leader a question in reference to the appropriation bills.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will have that privilege when we go into the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, immediately after the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] addresses the House, that the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE] may address the House for 20 minutes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I shall have to object.

AMENDING DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION ACT

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 10929) to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act with respect to excepted employment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.* That section 1 (b) of the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act is amended in the following respects:

- (1) At the end of paragraph (5) strike out "and";
- (2) At the end of paragraph (6) strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof ":", and"; and
- (3) After paragraph (6) insert the following new paragraph:

"(7) Service performed in the employ of the following: All religious institutions and schools maintained by them; colleges or universities, no part of the net earnings of which inures to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual."

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, that concludes the business of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

WAR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1937

Mr. PARKS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 11035) making appropriations for the military and nonmilitary activities of the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937, and for other purposes; and pending that, Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the gentleman from Ohio in reference to general debate. It has been suggested that we have general debate on the bill today. I hope that tomorrow we can confine the debate to the bill and, if possible, close debate; but at any rate, even though it went into Wednesday for a little, we could still conclude on Friday and pass the bill Friday afternoon, the time to be equally divided and controlled between the gentleman from Ohio and myself.

Mr. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, it is quite agreeable that we close the debate on Wednesday, but I think it might be well

if we continue the general debate into Tuesday, for I have special requests for time. Is it the gentleman's desire to have general debate close today?

Mr. PARKS. I hope we may do that.

Mr. BOLTON. To be confined to the bill entirely.

Mr. PARKS. And confine the debate thereafter to the bill.

Mr. BOLTON. Could we not make it more liberal and bear that in mind tomorrow, but leaving it flexible so that if we have continuing requests general debate may continue tomorrow?

Mr. PARKS. I do not believe we would finish this week if we did that.

Mr. BOLTON. I am just as anxious as the gentleman is to finish the bill this week.

Mr. PARKS. I think we should go on with general debate today, the debate to be confined to the bill tomorrow. If it should be impossible to conclude general debate today for any particular reason we might extend the time or at least consider an extension of time tomorrow.

Mr. BLANTON. Why does not the gentleman change his request and ask unanimous consent to allow general debate to run on today, to be equally divided between himself and the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. PARKS. That is a good idea. I will do that.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. RICH. We are taking up these appropriation bills, and I should like to ask at this time what the status of these appropriation bills is. When we had up for consideration the independent-offices bill, the Interior Department bill, and the Treasury and Post Office Departments bill we found that those bills involved greater expenditures than a year ago. The majority in this House, and the majority leader ought to assign the responsibility to someone of cutting down these appropriations. If there is going to continue the expenditure of money and greater appropriations every year, when are you going to balance the Budget? I think it is the duty of the majority leader or somebody on that side to take charge of things in the House of Representatives and see that this may be accomplished.

The regular order was demanded.

Mr. PARKS. I may say to the gentleman that we are within the Budget on both sections of this bill.

The SPEAKER. What is the request now of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. PARKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate may run along today, the time to be equally divided between the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOLTON] and myself.

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

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business on Calendar Wednesday this week may be dispensed with.

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

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask if the majority leader is going to have someone on that side take the responsibility for cutting down these appropriations?

Mr. BLANTON. Why does not the gentleman assume that responsibility?

Mr. RICH. I have tried every way I possibly can to do just that, and the gentleman from Texas is aware of that fact. Somebody on that side ought to do it.

The regular order was demanded.

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

There was no objection.

WAR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1937

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. PARKS] to go into the Com-

mittee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of H. R. 11035, the War Department 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 for the consideration of the bill H. R. 11035, with Mr. PARSONS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. PARKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 25 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment my colleague from Arkansas [Mr. PARKS] on the hard and arduous work he has done on this bill. For not only the work he has done in preparing this bill but for the work he has done in checking up Army projects all over the United States and in our possessions, I think he deserves great credit and the thanks of the House and Nation. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, the people of the United States are not envious of anything that the people anywhere else in the world possess. The people of the United States are not jealous of any other government anywhere on the face of the earth. The people of the United States do not covet anything which people elsewhere have and possess. The people of the United States do not want or expect anything from any other people on earth except good will and fair treatment. The people of the United States are peaceful people. They do not want war with any other nation. They want only friendly relations.

I am one of the economists of this House. I believe in economy in Government. For 20 years on this floor I have fought against waste, against extravagance, and against graft in Government. I have fought for strict economy. Yet I am one of those who believe that in order to preserve the peace of our country, in order to keep this country out of war, and in order to preserve the integrity of our Nation internally it is absolutely necessary that there should be sane and adequate preparedness and national defense. [Applause.] I am willing to vote for every dollar necessary to give us adequate preparedness and sane national defense.

Mr. Chairman, there was a time on the frontiers of western Texas when a man could not properly protect his person, family, or his property unless he had a good gun, kept in good condition, available at all times, unless he had good ammunition, unless he kept the gun loaded, unless he knew how to use it, and unless he was quicker on the draw than anyone else. He did not disarm as long as enemies of law and order went armed. As long as there was no adequate protection to his person, his family, and his property except by being well armed and knowing how to use his gun, he carried it in a convenient and accessible place on his person.

But when law and order prevailed, and disarmed the dangerous thief and organized desperado, and granted adequate protection to family and property, then the good citizens on the frontiers of western Texas disarmed and cast aside their trusty and dependable six-shooters. I have seen some of the finest citizens in the United States wear guns all over the district of our friend, EWING THOMASON, of El Paso.

Mr. THOMASON. Yet they were all law-abiding citizens.

Mr. BLANTON. Certainly. They were all law-abiding citizens and men who believed in law and order and believed in law enforcement. They did not want the property of other people, but they wanted other people to let their property alone.

When all nations of the world disarm and law and order is guaranteed without it I stand ready and willing then to vote to disarm the United States. But with the present situation prevailing I want to see enough 16-inch guns placed in strategic places on our coast and in our possessions so that if any domineering enemy should ever attack us and should bring one of its modern \$50,000,000 battleships within 27 miles of our coast with unfriendly designs against us we could blow it out of the sea. This is what we are going to be prepared to do, and when we are prepared to do it we will never have to shoot a 16-inch gun. The mere knowledge on the part of nations of the world that we are ade-

quately prepared will keep us from ever having to fire a gun. No enemy is ever going to risk a \$50,000,000 battleship with its accoutrements within 27 miles of one of our 16-inch guns, which, under our present equipment and training, could blow it out of commission with one 900-pound projectile.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. It never could be done with 1 projectile or 1 torpedo or 12 torpedoes or 12 projectiles.

Mr. BLANTON. I did not yield to the gentleman. Whenever the gentleman wants to interrupt my remarks he must first secure permission.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. I withdraw the remark.

Mr. BLANTON. Under the rules I could strike out the interpolation, but I will not do it. Whenever the gentleman wants me to yield I want him to conform to the rules.

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

Mr. BLANTON. I am going to yield in a few minutes.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. I withdraw the remark.

Mr. BLANTON. I know something about the efficacy of 900-pound projectiles from our 16-inch guns.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Will the gentleman yield now?

Mr. BLANTON. No; I am making my own speech.

I repeat that I know something about the efficacy of 900-pound projectiles from our 16-inch guns. When I spoke of one of them being able to blow a battleship out of commission I was speaking figuratively. Of course, I realize that probably one projectile would not do it, but where one comes from others can follow.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to insert some tables and data and excerpts that I desire to refer to.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. BLANTON. Certainly; I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and in order to be able to yield to my colleagues to a reasonable extent I asked for permission to extend my remarks.

Mr. RICH. I am interested in national defense, and I would like to know who is to be the judge of just what we have to do to reach the point of adequate protection only. I believe the gentleman formerly was interested in economy.

Mr. BLANTON. Formerly?

Mr. RICH. Formerly, yes; and I want the gentleman to maintain that attitude.

Mr. BLANTON. Why, seriously, right today I am more seriously interested in economy in 1 second than my friend from Pennsylvania will be from now until he dies. [Laughter.]

Mr. RICH. I question that statement, but I would like the gentleman to explain just when that point is reached, and I am interested in hearing his discussion of it.

Mr. BLANTON. I do not mean to be abrupt with my friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH], who, when not engaged in partisan politics here, is a most valuable and conscientious legislator, I consider him one of the most earnest and conscientious Members on the Republican side of the aisle. He ought to receive more consideration from his leadership over here, and if they would follow him, it would help wonderfully in the affairs of the Nation.

Mr. RICH. I am not worried about that. All I am interested in is what the House of Representatives does.

Mr. BLANTON. Answering my friend, as to what we deem adequate preparedness, we make up our own minds after hearing from our General Staff and the many splendid major generals in our Army and checking up the situation in person.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. If the gentleman will yield, as I understand, the gentleman believes that adequate protection is the best way to prevent war and is the best kind of economy.

Mr. BLANTON. Certainly; it is economy; and whenever you maintain a proper air force, with a proper navy and army properly mechanized and motorized, and with our defenses properly equipped with a sufficient number of 16-inch guns that can shoot accurately 27 miles, no nation is going

to be foolish enough to bring a \$40,000,000 or \$50,000,000 battleship within their range.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. And that is good economy.

Mr. BLANTON. Yes. It is sane, wise economy.

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

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. COLDEN. The gentleman from Texas, I understand, made a visit to the Pacific coast this last fall in connection with his duties on this committee.

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; we checked up on Army projects all over the country. I drove my own car approximately 6,000 miles, and also went to Hawaii and the Panama Canal.

Mr. COLDEN. Did the gentleman find the Pacific coast as adequately prepared by way of national defense as it should be?

Mr. BLANTON. I am ashamed to tell my friend that it was not. We found some guns on the west coast and elsewhere that would not shoot within 7 miles of the range of guns on modern battleships. If proper provision had not been made, we would have been absolutely helpless.

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

Mr. BLANTON. In a moment. I want to tell my friend this: When your committee gets through with its program, if the Congress backs us up, no one can ever say that you are not adequately prepared, because we are going to see to it that the United States is adequately prepared, not only on the west coast but at the Panama Canal and in Hawaii and everywhere else. But it all cannot be done at once, but must be accomplished through a sane program that we can gradually but surely effectuate.

Mr. COLDEN. I heartily agree with what the gentleman has said; but does he not think that southern California and some points farther north are the most vulnerable points in the United States?

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman need not be uneasy, because we are looking after all of them, and we are sympathetic to the needs of southern California.

Mr. COLDEN. As I say, I am heartily in sympathy with what the gentleman has said, because we have been uneasy as to national defense on the Pacific coast.

Mr. BLANTON. I want to say that Congress will be recreant to its duty to the people of this country if it does not establish needed air bases on the Pacific coast at an early date. Congress should establish a proper air base around Fairbanks, Alaska, and a proper air base in the Seattle country, and if we do not take steps to coordinate them with everything else that goes with such needs there we will be recreant to our duty. I do not care how much it costs, Congress should vote the money to make the people of the United States secure. It will be economy. It will keep us out of war.

Mr. COLDEN. Does not the gentleman think that the air bases should be extended to San Francisco and southern California?

Mr. BLANTON. I can promise the gentleman that our committee is sympathetic and that the west coast from Alaska to San Diego will eventually be looked after.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; I gladly yield to my friend from Washington.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. The gentleman stated that one shell from a 16-inch gun—

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, I was stating that figuratively.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. It will take at least 12 torpedoes to sink a modern battleship, and they do not hit one time out of three.

Mr. BLANTON. My friend may not know that by the use of our Cloak range-finding board that a battleship running at full speed 27 miles away can be hit by our trained gunners with a few shots from our 16-inch guns, and one proper hit may put them out of commission. We have some improvements that are being perfected daily.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Will not other nations have the same improvements?

Mr. BLANTON. I will say that our Yankee ingenuity—when I was a boy I hated that word "Yankee"—but Yankee ingenuity of the people of our country will be just as alert and just as ingenious as the people of every other country.

Now, I cannot yield further, because I want to finish my remarks.

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

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; I cannot refuse my friend from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman has made an able presentation of the present condition. Is it not a fact that our present condition with reference to national defense is much better than it was 3 years ago?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; and it is going to be still much better.

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

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

Mr. MAY. I came into this discussion at the time the gentleman from Texas was speaking about the question of economy. In the hearings before the House Military Affairs Committee I think it has been clearly demonstrated that had we been adequately prepared for war when the World War started it would have been much less expensive for us, and probably we would not have gotten into it at all.

Mr. BLANTON. As one of those who voted for war on April 6, 1917, I know that we would have saved billions if we had been adequately prepared, and I honestly believe now that if Germany had known that the United States Government was adequately prepared—and it was not—and if she had known that the United States within a short time could mobilize 4,000,000 men and uniform and equip them and send nearly 2,000,000 of them across the sea she would never have given us the affront that caused us to enter that war.

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

Mr. BLANTON. No; I must get back to my speech. The man who knows how to fight is the man who keeps out of fights.

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

Mr. BLANTON. I know men on this floor, a dozen of them, who were splendid athletes and good boxers in their universities, men who took lessons under some of the finest sparring masters in the world, and they never get into fights because they know how to keep out of them. They are not afraid of fights. Some of them are as brave as lions, and I can see them in front of me now. They know how to keep out of fights, because they know how to fight. It is the nation that is prepared that is not afraid of another nation and knows how to laugh off some insignificant affront that keeps it out of fights.

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

Mr. BLANTON. I yield to one question.

Mr. RICH. Does the gentleman not think it is more important for the protection of our shores to have these air bases than it is to build a lot of battleships to send to other countries?

Mr. BLANTON. Certainly; but we must always have some battleships. We have been scientifically mechanizing and motorizing our Army, properly so. And yet when I asked the Chief of Staff—and you will find it in the hearings—whether the time would ever come when the United States Army could do without cavalry horses, he said, "No; neither now nor in the future"; and he said that from his experience as a general in the United States Army it is his belief that when you have two opposing forces, one without horses and one with them, everything else equal, the one with cavalry horses will prevail. They are absolutely needed, however much you mechanize and motorize your Army.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Will the gentleman yield for one very pertinent question?

Mr. BLANTON. No; I am sorry. If the gentleman wants to put his views into the RECORD, he can do it in his own

time. I am very sure that his views of national defense and mine do not coincide.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Just one little question?

Mr. BLANTON. I cannot, because I do not want to impose upon the good nature and kindness of my chairman. When we Members take oath here that we will defend the Constitution and our flag, we do not say merely "against all foreign enemies", do we? The President's oath does not say that. The oath of every public official of this Nation does not say that. We all take oath that we will defend our Nation against all enemies, both foreign and domestic, and, in my judgment, there is no scare of foreign enemies that is in front of the American people.

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

Mr. BLANTON. I regret that I have not the time. I am sorry. I must use, myself, what little time I have left. In my judgment, the greatest menace in our Nation today is from domestic enemies. I say that without fear or any reservation. It is from those within our own borders. It is those who claim to be Americans who, by their talk and by their action every day, if not seeking themselves to undermine our Government and to destroy our institutions and our Constitution, at least are giving aid and encouragement to those who are seeking to do it.

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

Mr. BLANTON. No; I cannot yield.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. The gentleman is—

Mr. BLANTON. That is not going into my speech.

Mr. MILLARD. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order; the gentleman from Texas does not yield.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, I can take care of myself, I thank the gentleman from New York. I am not going to allow unauthorized interpolations to go into my speech. All this talk against curbing communism and all this defense of communism on this floor and these advocates for reds who are trying to undermine our Government need not alarm us particularly; I may say to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] that I can count them in this House on the fingers of my two hands.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Name them.

Mr. BLANTON. If you will let me eliminate as many as I can count on the fingers of my two hands, you will not have any communistic expression on this floor. The few make a big hullabaloo. It is just a big hullabaloo.

Why any Members of this House appreciate having their names extolled in the Daily Worker, which is the official mouthpiece of the Russian Soviet, is beyond my comprehension. When it denounces me for denouncing communism I feel honored. If it ever agreed with me on anything I would feel dishonored. When it advocates and preaches disbelief in God, disbelief in all religion, the tearing down of our institutions, the destruction of our Constitution, and the overthrow of our Government by force and violence, I would feel disgraced if it agreed with me on anything. When it attacks and threatens me, I feel that it is a sure sign that I have been faithful to my country and have been doing my duty. It will never find any solace from anything I say here. I will never give it aid or encouragement.

Communists and the Daily Worker want us to disarm. They want no preparedness. They want no Army or Navy or National Guards or Reserves. They want us to be helpless. They want no Supreme Court. They want us to behead our Supreme Court judges. And strange to say aid and encouragement is being extended them by some of the Members of this House and by some newspapers in the country.

Here is an editorial written by V. O. Hatcher, a cheap, little editor, published in his Weekly Record, January 17, 1936, which is an inconsequential, unimportant newspaper which to most of its readers he distributes free and without charge. He cannot obtain enough paid subscribers to get a second-class post-office permit to mail his paper. Yet to every boy and girl in his county who may happen to read his editorial he may give a distorted, perverse view of the judicial branch of their Government, and an unjustified contempt for the

distinguished Justices who preside over the Supreme Court of the United States.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. PARKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Texas 10 additional minutes.

Mr. BLANTON. This is what this "two-bit" editor said about your Supreme Court:

Our United States Supreme Court, ever the servile minion of wealth.

How many Members here will get up and say that that is so? "Ever the servile minions of wealth." That means that since our Government began the judges of our Supreme Court have been the slaves of wealth, doing wealth's bidding. Since he has arisen, will the gentleman from Washington [Mr. ZIONCHECK] say that is so?

Mr. ZIONCHECK. What is this? I did not understand the gentleman.

Mr. BLANTON. This editor said that the Supreme Court of the United States has been "ever the servile minion of wealth."

Mr. ZIONCHECK. It usually has been; yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Now, is there anybody else besides the gentleman from Washington who will get up here and say that? If there is, I want to yield to him.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. If they are intellectually honest, they will.

Mr. BLANTON. I do not yield further to the one who has declared himself. I have found out where the gentleman stands. Is there any other Congressman here who will get up and say that, in his opinion, the United States Supreme Court has been "ever the servile minion of wealth"?

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. No; because I know the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky has an entirely different opinion of the Supreme Court of the United States.

Mr. MAY. I just thought possibly the gentleman used the wrong word when he said "there was no other 'Congressman' here who would say that."

Mr. BLANTON. Well, is there?

Mr. MAY. No, there is not; and I do not think there has ever been one here.

Mr. BLANTON. My friend from Washington [Mr. ZIONCHECK] agreed with it.

Mr. MAY. But you used the word "Congressman." [Laughter.]

Mr. BLANTON. Now, let me quote further from this editorial. The same "two-bit" editor of this "two-bit" newspaper says this about your Supreme Court:

They are nine old fossils.

Is there a Member of this House who will say of the Supreme Court of the United States that "they are nine old fossils"? If there is, God knows I want to see your countenance. [Laughter.] Is there? Does the gentleman from Washington say they are nine old fossils?

Mr. ZIONCHECK. There are about four or five anyway.

Mr. BLANTON. Well, we are finding out where the gentleman stands. Is there any other Member here who will say they are "nine old fossils"?

Mr. ZIONCHECK. If they are intellectually honest they will.

Mr. BLANTON. I believe my colleagues are intellectually honest. Is there any other Member here who will make that statement—that our Supreme Court Justices "are nine old fossils"? If there is another such Member here I will gladly yield to him. Our Supreme Court through Republican administrations and Democratic administrations has been composed of some of the greatest lawyers of the universe—splendid, outstanding American lawyers.

I do not agree with them sometimes. They render opinions which I do not think they ought to render, but I still have confidence in their honesty, in their ability, and in their integrity. I am getting tired of all this monkey business. It is only the grossly uninformed and those who are too highly prejudiced who would call the able and distinguished Justices of our Supreme Court "old fossils."

Let me quote further. This "two-bit" editor says: "Who were formerly corporation lawyers, steeped in the ancient and hallowed doctrine of the sacred rights of capital." Will any Member get up here and say that our nine Supreme Court Justices are that kind of corporation lawyers?

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Well, seven out of nine.

Mr. BLANTON. Well, even my friend from Washington admits there are two of them who are not?

Mr. ZIONCHECK. That is right.

Mr. BLANTON. Then you say that this editor lied about two of them?

Mr. ZIONCHECK. He was mistaken about one or two. [Laughter.]

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Does the gentleman know any lawyer in the practice who would decline a retainer from a corporation?

Mr. BLANTON. No; I do not.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. You do not know what?

Mr. BLANTON. Just a minute. Do not interrupt my speech any more without conforming to the rule.

Mr. PARKS. Mr. Chairman, I know the gentleman from Texas is perfectly capable of taking care of himself; but I think we ought to proceed in order in this body. I seriously object to Members sitting in their seats and addressing remarks to the speaker. I insist that we have order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will say that when a Member is speaking and another desires to interrupt, he should first address the Chair and ask the Member if he will yield.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, while in the law practice I have represented very few corporations in my life. Most of the time I have represented persons suing corporations when I was in the practice of law. I have been in some pretty good-sized cases, both in the State and Federal courts; but I want to say this to you, that most of the lawyers, when they enter practice, are hoping that some day they will be employed at big retainers by some big concerns. They are not ashamed when they get employed by big concerns and are paid big retainers. How many lawyers here would deny a retainer from a big concern if he were in the practice of law? Is there anybody here who will get up and say that he would not accept such a retainer?

Mr. ZIONCHECK. I will.

Mr. BLANTON. I do not think the gentleman from Washington would ever have a chance of getting one from a good-sized corporation. [Laughter.]

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Because they know I would not represent them.

Mr. BLANTON. I do not yield further.

The other day one of the Washington newspapers criticized the House of Representatives and the Congress of the United States very severely because the Judiciary Committee of the House favorably reported the Kramer bill. It said we were "red" baiters. I got this from my friend from Massachusetts "that it is better to be a 'red' baiter than a 'red' lover." That paper got after the Congress because your Judiciary Committee, composed of some of the finest men in this House, reported favorably the Kramer bill way last June or July during the last session of this Congress. Let me show you what the Kramer bill provides.

Mr. MCFARLANE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BLANTON. I am sorry, but I have not the time.

Here is the Kramer bill. Now, if there is any Member here who is backing up this "red" loving newspaper, I want him to listen to these few lines, for they are the whole of the whole Kramer bill:

That any person who knowingly and willfully shall advocate the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence shall upon conviction thereof be punished by a fine of not more than \$5,000 or imprisoned for not more than 5 years, or both.

That is all of the Kramer bill. Is it bad? It is bad for "reds." As an American citizen I am for this kind of law. Whenever by insidious subversive propaganda some dirty scoundrel on the pay roll of the Soviet Republic, follower of

the Third International, comes over here and seeks to undermine this Government and to overthrow it by force and violence, he ought to be sent to the penitentiary.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. BLANTON. No; I am sorry; I cannot. I have not the time.

Then this paper got after the Senate because it reported favorably and passed the Tydings bill. Is there anything wrong with the Tydings bill? Here is the Tydings bill—it is a short bill and it can be easily understood by a child:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That whoever with the intent to incite disaffection advises, counsels, urges, or solicits any member of the Army and Navy of the United States to disobey the laws or regulations governing the Army and the Navy, or whoever with the intent to incite disaffection publishes or distributes any book, pamphlet, paper, print, article, letter, or other writing, which advises, counsels, urges, or solicits any member of the Army and Navy of the United States to disobey the laws and regulations governing the Army and the Navy shall be punished—

And so on. Then it provides punishment. Is that not a good bill? It is bad for the "reds."

Is there anybody here who will join this "red" loving newspaper in its fight to stop laws that prevent communizing our Army and Navy?

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Here is one. I will tell you why: Because I am a Jeffersonian Democrat.

Mr. BLANTON. I am sorry. I am sorry the gentleman is choosing such company. I am choosing these God-fearing, God-loving colleagues of mine here who stand for the Government of the United States as against Soviet Russia; who stand for our Army and Navy being wholly disaffected by any subversive propaganda.

Is there any other Member who will stand in this body and say we should not stop subversive efforts to communize our Army and Navy?

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Will the gentleman let me tell him why I stand that way?

Mr. BLANTON. Just a minute. I want to find out how many Members would stand for disaffection of the Army and Navy.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. That is an unfair statement; it is patently unfair.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I do not yield to the gentleman; I do not care to yield all my time to him.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas declines to yield.

Mr. BLANTON. I want to find out how many colleagues there are here who believe it is right for the followers of the Soviet Republic of Russia to come here and in this damnable and subversive manner try to disaffect our Army and Navy and make the enlisted personnel disobey the rules of their superior officers.

[Here the gavel fell.]

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

Mr. PIERCE and Mr. BOILEAU rose.

Mr. BLANTON. I yield first to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. PIERCE. I want to say that I will probably vote against the Kramer bill; and I will give my reasons.

Mr. BLANTON. Do not do it now, please, as I have only 5 minutes more.

Mr. PIERCE. At that time I will.

Mr. BOILEAU. The gentleman asked Members to rise. Does he mean that nobody can have an honest objection to anything placed in those bills?

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman is against them. All right; now, there are three. Is there anybody else?

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I would say to the gentleman from Texas that the penalty in neither bill is severe enough.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman is quite correct. If it were wartime, they would be taken out and shot at sunrise.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BOILEAU. Is it within the rules of the House for a Member to propound questions to the Members of the House

and ask how Members stand? Is not the policy of the House a matter to be determined by a majority vote and not by one or two or three advocates of a measure?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas has the floor and is proceeding in order.

Mr. DUNN of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I am sorry; I have not the time. I cannot yield to the gentleman. I know what the gentleman thinks with reference to these things, and he does not think as I do.

Mr. DUNN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I will yield to my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, because he and I are good friends, although we sometimes do not agree.

Mr. DUNN of Pennsylvania. What was the question which the gentleman asked the Members of the House a while ago?

Mr. BLANTON. I asked whether there was any other Member who is against these bills to stop overt acts or insidious propaganda causing our men in the Army and Navy to be disaffected and to disobey the orders of their superior officers? That is the question. The gentleman is not for that, is he?

Mr. DUNN of Pennsylvania. I am not.

Mr. BOILEAU. The gentleman asked awhile ago who was against these various bills.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, the time has come for a show-down on this question. The time has come for the people of the United States to know whether we are for the people of the United States or for the paid hirelings of Soviet Russia who come to the United States to cause disaffection in our Army and Navy. The time has come when we should know whether or not we are for letting these foreign Communists slip in and get into our schools all over the country—Chicago, Columbia, and other universities of this country—with their subversive matter. I am against it. I do not want my grandchildren to be taught by any such professors.

In his Washington Post for last Saturday, February 8, 1936, Mr. Eugene Meyer's editorial writer, under the title "Little Red Rider", criticized Congress for attaching an amendment to the District appropriation bill stopping the teaching of communism in the Washington schools. Is Eugene Meyer and his Washington Post in favor of communism? Do they want communism taught in the Washington schools? Over 92,000 Washington children attend these schools. With this rider, not one of the 3,000 school teachers in the schools in Washington can now teach communism. We have stopped it. Does Eugene Meyer want to revive it? Does he not know that he is working in double harness with the Daily Worker, the paid mouthpiece of Soviet Russia, when he publishes such editorials?

I want to say to my colleagues that I think just as much of the school-teaching profession as does any other man in this House. My sister has devoted her entire life to teaching. She was the first woman in my State to hold the position of State superintendent of public instruction in Texas. For 20 years she has been with the State university at Austin, and has devoted her whole life to the teaching profession. Some of the finest people in the world are engaged in teaching. There are, on the other hand, some black sheep, such as you will find in every flock. It is just like any other profession. You will find good and bad. You will find some outstanding Americans loyal to the cause. You will find some who are willing to scatter subversive principles to the youth of our land.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield to my friend from Massachusetts, who has done a great work in this matter.

Mr. McCORMACK. The unfortunate thing about the teaching profession is that there is a small percentage who believe they should instruct students and pupils what to think as distinguished from their duty of instructing them how to think. I agree with the remarks of the gentleman.

Mr. BLANTON. And we must protect students from that kind of teachers.

Mr. McCORMACK. Then, when that small group is attacked, they claim their academic freedom is being taken away from them and make the claim they are being abused.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman is correct. I must refer to another matter before I conclude.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TINKHAM] in his speech last Thursday not only unjustly criticized Ambassador Page, who is now dead, but he likewise viciously attacked a very good friend of mine from my own State—one of our greatest Americans—Mr. Edward M. House, a man who was a close personal friend of Woodrow Wilson and the man who is also a close personal friend and adviser of Franklin D. Roosevelt. In referring to acts of Edward M. House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TINKHAM] said:

This scandalous and perfidious conduct represents the most offensive kind of secret diplomacy.

And then he had the audacity to make the following statement:

Mr. House was one of the principal promoters of the candidacy of Woodrow Wilson for the Presidency and was one of the intimate advisers of President Wilson, particularly in relation to foreign affairs.

Edward M. House is still alive. He was one of the principal promoters of the candidacy of Franklin D. Roosevelt for the Presidency, and today he is one of the intimate advisers of President Roosevelt.

The loyal friends of Mr. Edward M. House are legion in the United States. He can be in no way hurt by anything the gentleman from Massachusetts may say about him. He has rendered distinct service to his country. It was rendered gratis, wholly without pay or hope of reward.

I remember when I was a young man in the University of Texas. During my 7 years there in the academic and law departments it was necessary that I should earn my own college expenses. At night, for 7 years, I kept the books for a wholesale and retail grocery firm in Austin and worked some in their store during the daytime.

Many times I walked when going down to the store. We did not have automobiles in those days. Once I was awfully tired, and while walking down the street a man in a buggy came along. He said, "Son, do you want a ride?" I said, "Why, certainly I do." I got in the buggy and there was Edward M. House driving his own horse, a multimillionaire, plain and unassuming, having time and inclination to think about a poor college boy walking along the street and wanting to help him. That is typical of Colonel House's entire life. He tried to help everybody. He has helped more Governors and he has helped more Presidents than any other man I know of.

He has never asked for a single dollar in salary for either himself or his friends. He has never asked a personal favor from any government. He is an outstanding American. Long after the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TINKHAM] is dead, gone, and forgotten, the name of Edward M. House will stand out in the memory of the American people as a patriot. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, under the leave granted me to extend and to print excerpts, I want to quote two valuable articles from the Washington Herald, the following from last Sunday, to wit:

[From the Washington Herald of Feb. 9, 1936]

"RED" PROPAGANDA IN UNITED STATES—OUR COLLEGIANS DUPED—COMMUNISTS GAIN GRIP ON SCHOOLS—DEPRESSION AIDS RADICALS TO MOBILIZE YOUNG AMERICA

For the past 5 months or more a group of earnest college students have been making a Nation-wide survey of the extent and effect of communism on our institutions of higher education.

In all, more than 30 universities and colleges were actually visited in person or canvassed by them.

Every effort was made to obtain a calm, unbiased picture of the actual situation.

The following is the first of a series of articles setting out the result:

ARTICLE 1

How strong is the Communist foothold among the million students in American colleges and universities?

Is the revolutionary movement for a Soviet America, under the guidance of Moscow, growing in our schools of higher learning? How is it being promoted and how is it being combated?

To answer these questions, an impartial, fact-finding group of students set out in August 1935, to conduct a survey of the leading colleges of the country. The investigators mingled with all groups and elements.

Altogether the survey embraced about 30 major institutions, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, namely:

In the East, Columbia University, Columbia Teachers College, New York University, College of the City of New York, Smith College, Amherst, Rutgers, Princeton, Harvard, Yale, Dartmouth, Cornell, Syracuse, Bennington, and Vassar.

In the Midwest, the University of Chicago, Northwestern University, University of Wisconsin, University of Michigan, University of Illinois, Ohio State University, and University of Minnesota.

#### "REDS" HAVE FOOTHOLD

On the Pacific coast, the University of Southern California, Los Angeles Junior College, University of California at Los Angeles, Leland Stanford University, University of California (Berkeley), University of Oregon, Oregon State University, and the University of Washington.

On the basis of this survey, it can be definitely asserted that the Communists have established a strong foothold in the American student body.

Although still comparatively small, numerically, the Communist invasion is potentially powerful and has made tremendous steps forward in a short period of time.

A vast quantity of college periodicals, pamphlets, and leaflets, all carrying on blatant propaganda, has been gathered in the course of this investigation. In most cases the financial source responsible for the production of this "literature" remains shrouded in mystery.

#### AIDED BY DEPRESSION

The Communist minority takes advantage of the profound interest which the depression has awakened in current political and social problems on the American campus.

Although Communists and Communist sympathizers form less than 2 percent of the American student body, they are a militant minority able to sway much greater numbers on various specific issues which are raised to agitate the student minds.

In all countries students have ever provided inflammatory material for revolutionary agitators. The youthful ardor, the spirit of adventure, have made students the favorite fodder of insurrectionary plotters. The Communist International has traded on this explosive material for many years in Europe, as well as in Asia and South America.

The change wrought in the American student body by the depression has opened to the Communist International a new field of exploitation. Never before was the American campus so alive to contemporary national and international questions as it is today.

#### DECEIVED BY MINORITY

The number of students displaying a healthy, vigorous interest in the world-wide crisis of our times far exceeds that of the Communist minority this survey has established.

But the aggressive Communist minority, highly organized and cleverly disguised, has been able to capitalize on this interest by sponsoring "pacifist" and "antiwar" and "academic freedom" campaigns which the Communists use as a means to their end.

The eagerness for new ideas, the consciousness of a changing world, the momentous economic and political events in the life of America have made the average American student ripe for propaganda. Yet there has hardly been any sane and constructive effort on the part of our educators or molders of public opinion to combat insidious propaganda disseminated by crafty methods.

#### CREATE DISTURBANCES

Paid Communist field workers operate openly on the college campuses of the country. With the aid of a shouting and agitating minority they have been able to create frequent and unwhole-some disturbances in the universities and colleges.

Yet 9 out of 10 students will scoff at campus Communists and other "left wingers." In most colleges the Communist students are of the type generally not cultivated by the leading groups or fraternities. These agitators are usually idealists, some of them dreamers, who for various reasons had already failed to become prominent in the traditional campus activities. These young people flock with a handful of misled intellectuals to the Communist camp because it offers them a new field of endeavor.

But how does the small minority of Communists manage to attain such a wide scope of influence? A nucleus of 5 or 10 or 20 Communist students operates merely as a steering committee for stirring up trouble whenever a crisis can be created on any immediate pretext in sight.

#### "UNITED FRONT" TACTICS

The pretext is turned into a general issue. The appeal is then made on a broad front, and the regular students find themselves fighting side by side with many individuals whose ideas are diametrically opposed to their own.

These are the tactics of the "united front." Such concerted efforts on the part of a number of extremists swell the ranks of interested students, and eventually draw unsuspecting young men and women into camouflaged Communist organizations.

The Communist minority has thus gained such prestige through national strikes on Armistice Day and other big demonstrations. Its steady progress, however, is achieved by the work of each local body knowing the best possible attack in its particular field of action. This local activity is carried on by experts in revolutionary strategy.

#### STUDENTS ARE DUPES

Most of the students who lend their support to the noisy campaigns engineered by the Communists on local issues do not realize that they are being used as dupes for ulterior purposes. The same is true of many "liberal" professors and clergymen who join in the defense of these campaigns.

In the institutions surveyed it has been found that Y. M. C. A.'s and Y. W. C. A.'s various "open forums" and lecture platforms are unsuspectingly being placed at the disposal of organizations furthering the program of Communist revolution in this country.

The Communist appeal to the students is not an isolated effort. It is part of the strategy of the Communist International to enlist the entire youth of the country in the acknowledged struggle for a Soviet America. It is part of the "united front" of the youth formed by the dexterous hand of Moscow.

#### MOBILIZED FOR MOSCOW

This "united front" was the keynote of an address delivered in Moscow by Gil Green, of New York, national secretary of the Young Communist League. Speaking before the Seventh World Congress of the Communist International, he told of the work of his organization and boasted of 1,000,000 youth in the United States. His remarks were later published in a pamphlet circulated by the Young Communist League.

The college youth is in the van of this growing front. Large numbers of American students have become aware of the youth movements in Europe and have been wondering if the time has come for young Americans to take an active interest in national affairs.

The Communists have seized upon this desire of the youth to do things, to assume responsibility, and are telling the students that the young generation must lead the country to a better future. By effectively concealing their true colors the agents of Moscow are mobilizing the great American student body.

And the following valuable article appeared in the Washington Herald this morning:

[From the Washington Herald of Feb. 10, 1936]

#### STUDENTS ORGANIZED FOR COMMUNISM—SOVIET UNITED STATES BEING TAUGHT ON COLLEGE CAMPUSES—"UNITED FRONT" MASKS EFFORT TO ESTABLISH SOVIET UNITED STATES

"Agitate! Organize! Educate!" are the orders given Communist student leaders on every college campus this survey has covered. All effort is concentrated to solidify the new "united front" of left-wing students with their progressive and liberal fellows.

Every opportunity for a demonstration on any campus, every chance to incite to riot, every possible excuse for a noisy campaign is quickly exploited in the interests of the "united front."

The theory of the Communist International is that discontent breeds recruits for the cause of revolution. If there is no discontent, create it! If there is local discontent, fan it into general disturbance!

#### FIRST MOVES QUIET

This was not the method pursued by the Communist International when it first invaded the American campus, it is revealed by the survey of the country's leading institutions of learning.

Up to 1931, the only radical organization among American students was the Socialist Student League for Industrial Democracy, formed in 1905 by Jack London and Upton Sinclair.

This collegiate society had made fair progress, adhered to serious and sober thought, attempting to bring about Socialist control of the Government by democratic means.

In 1931 the nucleus of the present Communist movement was organized, when the New York Student League, influenced strongly by the Communist Party, sprang to the fore, and included many left-wing Socialists.

The following year a group of New York City students made a dramatic "pilgrimage" to Kentucky to take part in the coal strike there. The movement spread to several metropolitan districts.

Two bus loads of students left New York City for Kentucky in March of 1932 to "investigate" the coal strike. Many were seriously interested in social problems. There were about 75 students from the colleges in New York plus a handful from Smith, Harvard, and one or two other schools.

However, the nucleus of the caravan is found to have been of the publicity-seeking type that sought to bring no good to the State of Kentucky.

A crowd of a couple hundred people, some of them armed and wearing badges of deputy sheriffs, stopped the first bus at the Kentucky borders, called its occupants, among other things, "aliens and agitators", and escorted them to a hurried courthouse hearing. Then they were sent out of the State under guard.

The students were furious, protested to Governor Laffoon, and made a public statement to the striking miners, which further helped to incite them. And although a series of interviews and hearings followed, they could not get back into Kentucky, where irate citizens were in arms against practically everybody foreign to Kentucky at that time.

#### AGITATOR IS TEACHER

A University of Pennsylvania teacher, Maynard Kreuger, led a group of students carrying banners to the Morgan establishment in Philadelphia. Police broke up the demonstration and jailed Kreuger for "inciting to riot."

Kreuger is now a professor at the University of Chicago, and an active leader of the "united front." At the same time Reed Harris was expelled from Columbia University, and therefore automatically removed from the editorship of the Columbia Spectator.

Other investigations and student actions followed throughout the country. University of Chicago students tried to "investigate" in their own State. California students became interested in water-front, seamen, and longshoremen problems.

Such were the beginnings of the National Student League. The policy followed by its Communist mentors, as reported to the survey group throughout the country, was to ally the students with the "underdog", to make them comrades in arms of embattled workers.

URGED SOVIET AMERICA

The open battle cries of the moment were, "Support the soviet fatherland!" and "Build a soviet America!"

But these tactics and slogans, based on propaganda in favor of imitating the soviet revolution, left the large body of students cold. The "liberal" element kept away from the stark Communist banner, the survey findings show.

Today this is still true. More than 2,000 students were contacted personally in this survey. Fewer than 20 of these, aside from those already in Communist organizations, answered "Yes" to the questions: "Do you believe communism has any place in America?" or "Would you work for a soviet America?"

Then the National Student League staged a series of raids upon the Socialist Student League for Industrial Democracy, the only available force on the campus which lent itself to conquest. By this time Norman Thomas was dominating the latter organization.

"REDS" CLAIM LEAGUE

The raids were carried out by the "boring from within" tactics. This was made possible, in the first place, by the Communist group's name. The National Student League was a harmless-sounding title. It was calculated to draw into its net many gullible progressives.

As the National Student League grew, largely at the expense of Socialists, the Young Communist League could no longer conceal its pride in the growing organization. It courted credit from the Communist International for its achievement in developing the National Student League.

This led to serious trouble between the Socialists and the Communists during the next 2 years. These sectarian bickerings continued until Stalin changed completely the policy of the Communist International and launched the new campaign of the "united front."

The new tactics, the survey finds, relegated the real aims of the Communists to the background. Instead, all emphasis was put on immediate problems of interest to the typical student.

Mr. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BOILEAU].

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Chairman, I want to take this minute which has been placed at my disposal because I am fearful that certain injections I may have made into the remarks of the gentleman from Texas might be misinterpreted. I want to make it very clear that, so far as I am concerned, I am as much opposed to communism as is the gentleman from Texas or any Member of the House. On the other hand, I want to make it clear that I have a wholesome regard for the constitutional rights of the citizens of this country—the right of freedom of speech and the press. I also want to make it clear that, in my opinion, we should not enact laws that may be regarded as espionage acts; nor do I uphold any element which seeks to suppress freedom of speech or freedom of the press. I want to make it clear that I do not uphold anyone who advocates the overthrow of our Government by force or violence. I do, however, want to preserve for American citizens such rights and liberties as are guaranteed to them under the Constitution of the United States.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOCHT].

Mr. FOCHT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter written by myself on old-age pensions.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FOCHT. Mr. Chairman, I am afraid that my subject, as well as my oratory, will be somewhat more moderate than what you have been hearing this morning, and yet the subject I shall discuss, I think, is quite germane to the dissertation we have had from the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON], having a direct relationship to his remarks. In other words, after a long search I have found what I think both Democrats and Republicans would like to have and would like to know about at this particular time as we approach a great campaign, followed by an election.

This subject may be entirely familiar to most of you, but until recently I was never able to get a complete confirmation of one of the most important subjects we discuss and debate in this country today; in other words, in a few minutes I am going to try to show you and the country how hopeless and utterly impossible it will be now or at any future time for socialism or communism to exist in the American Republic.

This is woven around the rule of perpetuity, and this is the climax of research and study I have made over a period of many years. I heard here the greatest Socialist the world has ever known, probably the best educated Socialist America ever saw, our friend from Milwaukee, former Congressman Berger. He was graduated from at least three German universities and a couple in America. He said there are four or five or a dozen kinds of socialism in Europe and in America, and he discussed particularly that character of socialism that was enunciated and pressed forward up to the French Revolution by Rousseau, Mirabeau, and Robespierre, and the rest of those who finally went to the guillotine and whose theories were expressed up to the time Napoleon took possession of the French Assembly and swept the boulevards of Paris with his artillery. He even said that I was somewhat of a Socialist. He had heard me make speeches here, and having always been for a square deal for the laboring man, he said, "You have been giving expression here to something akin to socialism and", he said, "you have robbed us of our thunder; both the Democratic and Republican Parties have stripped us of all those beneficent, humanitarian things we have advocated, and we are left marooned."

Then, as you will recall, Norman Thomas, as a candidate on the Socialist ticket, received 100,000 less votes than the old chap, Eugene V. Debs, who had run 4 years before, and who at the time of his campaign was confined in the Atlanta Penitentiary, showing that that kind of thing in this country is dying out, and the reason it is dying out is because of the unfolding of the truth in regard to perpetuity, which makes it impossible for the so-called rich men to ever attain their final objective of entailing their accumulations.

The common-law rule against perpetuities prohibits the postponement of the absolute power of alienation of property for a longer period than lives in being and 21 years thereafter, an extension being allowed for gestation or a slightly modified form thereof, and this principle of law is in force in the following States.

Here I give you a list of the States in which there is a limitation on entailment. You see there is where the whole point is involved, and yet these Socialists and Communists never discuss that. These men may talk about people getting richer and richer, and piling up their money and perpetuating it in their families throughout all time, but they cannot do anything of the kind under the principle of law which I have just stated. I shall put this list in the RECORD so you can find just what is happening in your State.

This makes impossible the two things you have discussed this morning, and that you discuss almost every day here. This rule of law makes it impossible that such a thing could happen of perpetuating wealth in a family by entailment.

Mr. Chairman, let me say further that in this country we have seen every kind of socialism from the kind I have referred to to the international socialism of Karl Marx, which is another kind that followed the French Revolution. They wanted to standardize the labor of all the countries of the world. How utterly impossible this would be. Then they would say that we are going to have universal free trade without any standardization of the condition of the people. We have seen both political parties, Democratic and Republican, absorb what was meritorious and virtuous in the paternalism of socialism in this country until there is nothing left of the idea, particularly, since old-age pensions are assured and Government help for the blind has reached these unfortunates.

There is a reason for the eclipse of socialism, which I shall briefly state:

We have heard Socialists in their evident ignorance, at least the kind of socialism Victor Berger told me about, in-

weighing against the accumulation and perpetuation of wealth in America. I have listened to a great deal of this kind of false philosophy and the error held as to the pillars upon which this Nation of constitutional liberty rests. And what a lot of nonsense, since what is contended for in this idea has its very definite limitations. We all know the fathers when they made the Constitution omitted anything about entailments—no feudalism to stain this continent. The fathers said to the sovereign people, "Here is your land of freedom, given to you in fee simple—take it and protect it."

When I say there was and is no entailment on land and property here, but a limitation on how far an estate may be controlled by the will of a testator, I say what I am sure is not any too clear to many; that supports my contention as to the fallacy of socialism, but which, nevertheless, knocks socialism and communism into a cocked hat.

I have here and will insert into the Record the law as it applies in nearly every State in the Union, and which shows how far a testator may control his estate. This statement is thoroughly authentic.

This should be conclusive enough to break down the poppycock argument of some few college professors, here and there, that the rich always become richer and never poorer, and that the poor can never become rich.

There is one other great and transcendent reason why the rich can be held in leash, and that is the system of taxation which is always in the hands of the people. You saw during the World War an income tax of 75 percent, while there will soon go into effect a tax law even more drastic than that which takes much from the middle class while they live, and more if they give away any while they live, and most all if they wait until they die.

We are not saying the rich should not be taxed, but we have to aver that the socialistic and communistic theories that the rich cannot be reached except by appropriating all they have is erratic and impossible for intelligent minds to accept.

Truly, as Emerson said, this is a land of opportunity; in fact, man's last chance. That chance is here and to remain for all to acquire a competency and station in life on their own merits, but not by stripping others of what they have earned.

Statesmanship, benevolence, and fraternity should be gradually applied to equalize God's given blessings, but these blessings cannot be acquired by violence or usurpation or the establishment of a dictatorship and the dull and ignoble understanding of our present Government of attempted regimentation of our liberty into cringing submergence. [Applause.]

#### RULE AGAINST PERPETUITIES

The common law rule against perpetuities which prohibits the postponement of the absolute power of alienation of property for a longer period than lives in being and 21 years thereafter, an extension being allowed for gestation, or a slightly modified form thereof, is in force in the following States (where a statute declaratory of the rule was found the citation is given): Alabama, Laws 1931, page 816; Arkansas; California, Constitution, article XX, section 9, Civil Code, section 711; Colorado; Connecticut, Delaware; Florida; Georgia, Code 1933, sections 85-707; Illinois; Iowa, Code, 1931, section 10127; Kansas; Kentucky, Carroll's Statutes, 1930, section 2380; Maine; Maryland; Massachusetts; Missouri; Nebraska; Nevada; New Hampshire; New Jersey; New Mexico; North Carolina; Ohio, Code, 1930, sections 10512-8; Oregon; Pennsylvania; Rhode Island; South Carolina; Tennessee; Texas; Utah; Vermont; Virginia; Washington; West Virginia; Wyoming, Revised Statutes, 1931, sections 26-101.

Idaho, Annotated Code, 1932, sections 54-11, 202; Indiana, Burns' Statutes Annotated, 1933, sections 56-142; Montana, Revised Code, 1921, sections 6705, 6734; North Dakota, Laws 1933, chapter 203, Compiled Laws, 1913, section 5315; Oklahoma, Statutes 1931, sections 11756, 11759; South Dakota, Compiled Laws, 1929, sections 294, 322; limit the postponement of the absolute power of alienation to the lives of

persons in being, except that a contingent remainder in fee may be created on a prior remainder in fee to take effect in the event that the persons to whom the first remainder is limited die under 21 years of age, or upon any other contingency by which the estate of such persons may be determined before majority.

Arizona, Revised Code, 1928, section 2761; Michigan, Compiled Laws, 1929, section 13516; Minnesota, Mason's Statutes, 1927, sections 8045, 8053; New York, Cahill's Consolidated Laws, 1930, chapter 51, section 42; South Dakota, Compiled Laws, 1929, sections 294, 322; limit the postponement of the absolute power of alienation to the lives of two persons in being, except that a contingent remainder in fee may be created on a prior remainder in fee to take effect in the event that the persons to whom the first remainder is limited die under 21 years of age, or upon any other contingency by which the estate of such persons may be determined before majority.

Louisiana, Civil Code, section 1520, requires future estates to vest immediately.

Mississippi, Code, 1930, section 2117, allows the conveyance to any number of living donees and upon the death of the last of such donees to any person or heir.

North Dakota, Laws 1933, chapter 203, besides the foregoing limitations, has an alternate limitation which allows the suspension of the power of alienation for any period not exceeding 25 years.

Wisconsin, Statutes, 1931, section 230.15, limits the postponement of the absolute power of alienation to the lives of persons in being and 30 years thereafter.

#### POVERTY ABDICATES

Demands being made today for social security legislation would have been ridiculed out of the picture 10 years ago. In fact, less comprehensive programs were eased out of the legislative picture without ado.

Today, with a patchwork system of various phases of an ambitious social security program operating in various parts of the country, the seed has been sown, and the day is apparently not far distant when the medieval system of public charity, which too often accomplished little more than providing a body-and-soul existence and placing the stamp of pauperism upon the unfortunate, will have been relegated to the limbo of discarded usage.

Pennsylvania's mothers' assistance fund, now in its twenty-fourth year of operation, its blind-pension system, in vogue nearly 2 years, and its old-age assistance plan, which has been operating for more than a year, are examples of what can be done to sensibly meet the problems one hears so much about today.

All needs, to be sure, are not yet met by any one of these agencies, but their work has been gradually expanded and will continue to branch out. Untold good has been accomplished by each of these agencies and without an excessive burden upon the public.

The thought in mind is that social security is a gigantic problem, a problem which must be solved by degrees rather than overnight; that any such vast undertaking as abolishing want and suffering requires time to attain perfection and to encompass all needs.

It is gratifying that Pennsylvania is on the right path, that the Keystone Commonwealth is a step ahead of most of her sister States in this respect, and that there is definite hope for progress. (From the Sunbury Item.)

Notwithstanding the vast change in the customs and habits of the people during the past 30 years, it may not be said in truth that Christianity is being frowned upon as something effete, even though there are those who openly indulge in what was once looked upon as sinful. Dancing, card playing for prizes, drinking, and face painting are done openly, whereas years ago these pleasures were despised and denounced from the pulpit.

And yet Christianity is not perishing even though customs change.

For so much that is humanly sympathetic there must be more back of it and sustaining it than mere sentiment.

It is the Christian spirit that impels men to subscribe to great charities—colleges, churches, hospitals, and the weak and unfortunate.

And thank a merciful God that spirit is ever growing and expanding until we see poverty abdicating and the tears of unhappiness caused by penury wiped forever away.

After 5,000 years of only two classes, the patrician and plebeian, and the latter four-fifths of the whole, we see a tide of humanity impelled by the spirit of Christianity, sweep the harsh things of the world into oblivion and substitute gracious, kind-hearted humanity.

In 1831 Governor Wolf was defeated for Governor because he was for free education and Thaddeus Stevens was compelled to leap from a window of the State capitol to escape violence because he led a fight for free schools.

But the free schools came, then free books, and within a century we are talking of giving every boy and girl a free college education.

But the greatest achievement during the entire story of Christian civilization is the mothers' assistance fund and pensions for the blind and the aged.

In these great benevolences is the evidence that Christianity is not dead but is stronger than ever even though the habits of some have changed.

We are pleased to note the fine understanding of all this as expressed by the editor of the Sunbury Item in the article we quote at the top of this column. (B. K. F.)

#### UNNATURALIZED FOREIGN CRIMINALS

Recommendations on a Mifflin County grand jury that alien criminals be investigated and, where possible, deported strikes the right key and offers food for thought in Northumberland County.

For years on end the foreign element, for the most part unnaturalized, has been the cause of most of the heavy expense involved in the operation of Northumberland County's criminal courts. Perusal of the court records will show countless repetitions of alien names involving crimes of every description, including murder.

With the January grand jury convening next week, would it not be timely to launch an investigation in Northumberland County with a view to ridding the community—and the courts—of at least a sizeable portion of these undesirables?

Congressman B. K. FOCHT, of the Eighteenth District, has earned the admiration and commendation of all 100-percent Americans by his efforts in behalf of selective immigration and the deportation of alien criminals. The fight goes on.

The United States Department of Justice has given the cue by wholesale shipment of alien felons to their home countries, as witnessed from time to time at the Northeastern Penitentiary, Lewisburg. The county can well follow that lead. (Sunbury Item, Jan. 20.)

There is a law on the statute books of Pennsylvania, and placed there by Representative B. K. FOCHT in 1895, when he was a member of the lower house of the Pennsylvania Assembly, which provides for the deportation of unnaturalized foreigners quartered upon the Commonwealth. At that time it was found that there were being taken care of over 30,000 unnaturalized foreigners in the hospitals, protectories, and prisons of the State. Likely very many more are enjoying this high-priced public entertainment at this time.

The reason given for failure of the authorities to act under the provisions of this Focht bill of 1895 is that members representing the cities will not permit necessary appropriations to carry out the provisions of the act, inasmuch as the foreign element in all cities is so predominant that no man can be elected to Congress who favors measures of this kind and also the restriction of immigration.

So far as Pennsylvania, New York, and some Western States are concerned, everything is set for the deportation of criminal and unnaturalized foreigners, if the public officials have enough of what is commonly termed "intestinal fortitude" to clean house and leave room for American citizens and reduce taxes, as well as provide a wider opportunity for American unemployed.

There is nothing before us to accomplish the desired results excepting action. This the Item calls for; in fact, all Americans demand!

Mr. PARKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW].

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, judging by various announcements in the newspapers which appear to be ex cathedra, and by everything one hears around the Halls of Congress, I think we are warranted in having some feeling of apprehension that we are about to witness the most ideal exhibition of white-flag waving ever witnessed in any legislative body in any country in the entire history of the world.

In less than a week after Chairman McREYNOLDS, of the Foreign Affairs Committee, impressively informed the House Rules Committee that a powerful lobby is ensconced here to stop neutrality legislation because it might block foreign trade the announcement comes from a distinguished United States Senator and other high authorities that neutrality legislation has been stopped and that the Congress which was champing at the bit in its eagerness to keep America out of war will drop the subject and will extend the existing no-account neutrality law 1 year.

I wish to offer my warm congratulations to the great and puissant lobby for the progress it seems to have made in this fight. The lobby is a time-honored American institution dating away back to the "horse and buggy" days. It is as permanent as the Constitution itself and, I think, a little more permanent than the Bill of Rights. In various decades it seeks various objectives, but it is always the same old lobby. It will interest the American people to know that it is still flourishing—strong, powerful, and superactive. Its latest victory—killing neutrality legislation, if it has actually won such a victory—exemplifies the lobby in its fullest

flower and its finest and most facile form. I do not know of any more knightly and chivalric way to administer the coup de grace to neutrality legislation than for the advocates of said legislation to surrender without firing a shot.

This would be a great surrender—a historic surrender. It would be one of the greatest surrenders in American annals. It would be the "perfect surrender." The masterful retreat of the Federal forces at the first Battle of Bull Run would be nothing in comparison with it. It would be a surrender that would go down in history so that our children and our children's children and the America of all posterity may admire the perfect work of the antineutrality lobby of 1936. When and if we knuckle so gracefully to the demands of the third house in this matter, I think we might very well send a committee to wait on the foreign-trade lobby so graphically described by Chairman McREYNOLDS and ask it if there is any other legislation it desires. It might have some other helpful suggestions to make in regard to our foreign relations in general.

Mr. MORITZ. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUDLOW. I yield.

Mr. MORITZ. Is the gentleman in favor of the McReynolds neutrality bill?

Mr. LUDLOW. I am not, but I am in favor of neutrality legislation.

Mr. MORITZ. Then why is the gentleman advocating neutrality legislation?

Mr. LUDLOW. I have great hopes that we may be able by bringing the subject up to get behind a bill that will better fulfill the expectations of the country than the bill to which the gentleman refers.

Mr. MORITZ. By amendment?

Mr. LUDLOW. By amendment or otherwise.

Mr. Chairman, in view of our solemn and, I had hoped, sacred pledges to the American people, that we would enact legislation at this session that would keep our boys out of the hell of another foreign war, I was shocked when I read in a morning paper the other day the headlines:

Neutrality bill conceded dead at this session. Measure is not expected to become a law.

And I was given another shock when I read in Sunday's New York Times the glaring headline:

Neutrality bill to be abandoned.

And I want to say that I have been utterly amazed by the talk I have heard in responsible quarters to the effect that what we should do in regard to neutrality legislation is to do nothing at all.

I have been both amazed and distressed by the suggestion, seriously offered, that we should dawdle along until the existing Neutrality Act expires on February 29 and then quietly put over the entire subject of neutrality into the limbo of the unforeseen and unpredictable future, to be revived if and when the time ever comes to take up unfinished business.

#### LETHAL PROGRAM OF INACTION

Courageous, energetic action by the friends of real neutrality is needed to offset and neutralize this lethal program of procrastination and inaction. The Foreign Affairs Committee has furnished us with a basis of performance in the so-called McReynolds bill, and we should now proceed to act. The chairman and members of that committee have had a most grueling duty to perform, and they have exhibited zeal, patriotism, and devotion in the highest degree in the performance of the monumental task of drafting a permanent neutrality law. For them I have the highest respect. As a citizen and as a Member of Congress I pay my tribute of appreciation to their faithfulness and earnestness, while at the same time I utterly disapprove their product. I believe the bill that has come from the committee would be more likely to involve us in war than to keep us out of war, and I shudder when I think of section 4 of that measure—the big-stick section—which in effect transfers the power of making war from the Congress and vests it with the President, where it ought not to be.

I endorse every word John Bassett Moore has said in criticism of section 4 of the pending neutrality bill—and

then some. We have gone much further in recent years than we should toward setting up the President as an economic dictator in this country. Are we now, by adopting section 4, going to be unthinking enough to set up the President as a military dictator? If so, God help the country.

While I have the most affectionate admiration for the courtly and able gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McREYNOLDS], who is one of the ablest and most patriotic Members of this Congress, I believe the so-called McReynolds neutrality bill would be far worse than no legislation at all. But that is no reason we should drop this subject of neutrality legislation and do nothing. The McReynolds bill in its provision allowing normal quotas of war materials to belligerents would be terribly unjust to Italy. It would be terribly unjust to Germany. It would be terribly unjust to any country that might become involved in war with the British.

#### FORTY-THREE PERCENT OF EXPORTS TO BRITISH COUNTRIES

Why? Because 43 percent of all American normal exports go to British countries. In 1934, the last year for which we have complete export statistics, we sent \$842,150,000 worth of goods to British countries, \$64,091,000 worth to Italy, and \$106,649,000 to Germany. On that basis you can easily see how much we would contribute to Britain's capital war assets in the form of exports in case she becomes involved in war and how little, relatively speaking, we would contribute to Italy or Germany should one of those countries happen to be Britain's adversary.

The Census Bureau reports that there are 1,790,424 persons in the United States who were born in Italy and 1,608,814 who were born in Germany, and every person so enumerated has American-born relatives. What would those vast national groups think of us if we were to enact a law that would give Britain such a tremendous advantage in the eventuality of war? Would they not be entitled to boil over with righteous indignation?

Mr. MORITZ. I heartily agree with the last statement referred to, but does not the gentleman think that an amendment providing that they may buy goods of us and pay in cash would solve it?

Mr. LUDLOW. That would be an improvement, but I do not believe in that kind of a neutrality bill.

With all due respect to the noble purposes of the author of the McReynolds bill, it was introduced in the wrong House. It should have been introduced in the House of Commons. It is not an American bill. If we fix up a contraption and call it a neutrality law that pumps \$13 worth of war supplies into Britain to every dollar's worth sent to Italy and that sends \$8 worth of supplies to Britain to every dollar's worth sent to Germany that, I submit, is not true neutrality. It is playing Britain's game with a vengeance. Of course, it was not designed for such a purpose but that will be its effect.

If we pass the pending bill with its "normal quotas" provision, I think we should send that gallant and intrepid veteran of the Secret Service, Chief Moran, out to investigate to see what has become of the American eagle. I think I can even now hear his stentorian voice reporting the result of his investigation:

"I searched among the mountain crags expecting to find the American eagle in its aerie, but it was not there. Then I secured a telescope and searched the illimitable spaces of the heavens, expecting to see it flying with head erect, its wings spread in splendid majesty, but it was not there. But finally I have found it. It is riding like a flyspeck on the back of the British lion."

Friends and Americans, if we are true to our responsibilities, if we are true to America, we cannot pass this bill with its transfer of the war-making power to the Executive and its British "equal quotas" provision. But we can pass a real neutrality bill that will go far to keep our boys out of the blood-letting orgies with which foreign nations regale themselves.

#### PROPOSAL OF VALUE

While I believe the McReynolds bill must be drastically amended if it meets the peace-loving hopes and aspirations

of the American people, I hail that measure as a proposal of value as a basis of action, and I hope that the leadership of the House will now put it forward so that not a single minute will be lost in framing a real neutrality law with teeth in it to take the place of the makeshift and abortive neutrality law that was passed at the last session. Let us spike the program of inaction with a program of action. Let us cease thinking in terms of trade and think in terms of humanity. Let us rise to the occasion and show the courage which the situation demands.

Persistent and insistent rumors have been afloat for some time about this Capitol to the effect that neutrality legislation is finally to be "put to sleep."

#### "HOT POTATO—FULL OF DYNAMITE"

That very phrase has been used in my presence to describe what apparently is going on behind the scenes. One friend of mine, who seems to be "in the know" on this proposition, said to me:

There is too much political dynamite in the neutrality question to risk handling it. A lot of us at both ends of the Capitol have decided that the best thing to do is to put all of the neutrality bills to sleep."

And then my friend, his voice quavering with emotion, added:

Neutrality is a hot potato, full of dynamite.

I have handled—and have dropped—a good many hot potatoes in my time, but I have never handled one which, besides being hot, was full of dynamite, from which I infer that neutrality is a very deadly kind of hot potato.

I think the Nation should be given warning of a movement of untoward interests to attempt to prevent any neutrality legislation whatever by this Congress. This movement is playing on emotions and influences that are most potent in the psychology of gentlemen who place expediency above the hard and grueling exactations of duty. It is inspired by the thought that, as surely as Heaven exists, if we Members of Congress pass a real neutrality law we will bring upon ourselves heavy political reprisals from voters who are allied by strains of kinship to countries that would be affected and from Americans who would hope to profit by foreign trade and whose corns will be stepped on if we pass a real neutrality law. All of the forces of greed and selfishness are whispering: "Go slow on neutrality legislation."

#### JOB OF UNSURPASSED IMPORTANCE

But the American people have cut out a job for us unsurpassed in importance by any task ever submitted to a peace-time Congress and that is the framing of a real neutrality law that will prevent our boys from being dragged into foreign wars. Are we going to "make the word of promise to the ear and break it to the hope" of millions upon millions of American mothers who are expecting this Congress to throw some adequate protection around their flesh and blood? Is it possible that red-blooded Members of the American Congress will be guilty of such a pusillanimous surrender to expediency? I have too good an opinion of Congress to believe any such thing. My observation has been that Members of Congress as a rule are conscientious, patriotic men and women who want to do the right thing.

Americans everywhere—the rank and file of Americans—are crying aloud to us to pay heed to the advice of Washington against foreign entanglements. The American people know that the best way to keep ourselves from being dragged into foreign wars is to cut off all exports, loans, and credits from nations that go to war. They know that any legislation less stringent than that will fall short of the mark and will be pitifully ineffective. They know that just as long as we have trade and financial transactions with belligerent foreign nations we will be risking the peace of America to protect our trade and our loans. They know that in exchange for the mere bagatelle of business we would lose if we cut off all exports and loans to belligerent nations we would receive the inestimable assurance of peace, and that is what they want above all things else.

Before we rush into a stampede to kill neutrality legislation let us try to visualize how the public opinion of America would react to such a disaster. In dealing with a question

that involves life and death and the highest values of human existence the people of this country expect us to show a sense of responsibility. They do not expect us to run away from the performance of a plain duty.

## TIME FOR PATRIOTS TO RALLY

It is our blessed privilege to perform a great service for the American people and for humanity if we can but visualize in its correct proportions the magnitude of the task that has been committed to us. I repeat that the people of our country—the country we all love—have cut out a great job for us at this session of Congress in the framing of a permanent neutrality law of worth and substance and they are looking to us for faithful performance. Now is the time for patriots to rally. Now is the time for statesmanship to shine. If we do not perform that task with a full measure of faithfulness and devotion the Seventy-fourth Congress will dwell in the memory of men of our time and will be heralded to generations yet unborn as the most reprehensible Congress in history. After all of our glowing promises to protect the fine young manhood of America from the danger of being sacrificed in foreign wars, after all of our lip service to the cause of neutrality, let us not, for God's sake, march up the hill and then march down again.

Mr. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SAUTHOFF].

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Chairman, first let me say to my friend from Indiana, Mr. Ludlow, who has spoken so eloquently and who has taken such prominent interest in the subject of neutrality, that if we cannot interest the membership of this House in the subject, then let us talk to the galleries, and perhaps we may get some response from them.

## NEUTRALITY

All mankind abhors war, yet everywhere men say it is inevitable. Everywhere upon this earth men and women pray for peace, yet everywhere they are feverishly preparing for the next war. Every nation, every people in every clime is burdened with the costs of past wars, yet they are all voting tax upon tax for future wars. Why these amazing contradictions? The whole world hating and fearing war, yet driving relentlessly on to the next one. What madness hypnotizes the will so that it does the thing it dreads the most? What mental anesthetic has dulled the mind so that, numb and cold, it refuses to function? What fatal magic is there in this word "war" that men should lose their reason and, bereft of their senses, grope blindly over the precipice into oblivion?

Perhaps we can find our answer in the annals of the past. As we review the pages of history we hear again the martial tread of the conquering hordes—the ancient empires of the East founded upon conquest. Egypt under the Ptolemies, the oriental luxury of Babylon and Ninevah and Tyre. The glory of the Greeks and Alexander's 10,000 immortals mowing a path of blood from Macedonia to the borders of India; Rome dominating the civilized world. The military genius of a Caesar, a Ghengis Kahn, or a Napoleon leaves in its wake the bleaching bones of an entire generation. For many years the Spanish race dominated the civilized world, then the French, and then the English. To accomplish these ends they dipped their arms deep in the best blood of many lands. And the end is not yet. One might exclaim with the Wandering Jew, "How long, O Lord, how long?"

Is there then not enough intelligence and courage in our day to solve this problem—the problem of how to stay out of war? The answer to that question is simple. All we have to do to stay out of war is not to get into it. The main motive for war is greed. The lure of profits; the sordid lust for money and power. If then we remove this motive, will we not have achieved something of good for mankind? Surely we can all agree that your life shall not be taken merely that my profits may be increased. Of course, you admit that that is true. If it is true in the case of an individual, why then must it be less true in the case of a whole people? Does the fact of a greater number lend it sanctity and make this cause holy? The mere statement of the case is enough to show its absurdity.

Mass destruction, then, is no defense. And when that mass destruction is motivated by godless gain, it shocks the instincts of every intelligent mind. And yet in the face of that fact we sit here idle, drugged with the narcotic doctrine of defeatism—"It cannot be done." Let us arouse, my friends, and fight off this stupor. Every moral fiber of my being cries out against it. Can you look into the innocent eyes of a smiling baby and see beyond it in the years to come that lovely body slimy with muck and mire of a distant battlefield, wrenched and racked, groveling in the filth and vermin, gasping his last breath? Look closer into those eyes and read there the damning accusation, "You failed me."

I refuse to desert this cause. If I learned anything from my friend and teacher, the late Robert M. La Follette, it was this:

Boys, it is no disgrace to go down fighting; but the man who quits marks himself for life.

[Applause.]

He never quit. That great crusader for human freedom is an inspiration to every struggling minority. The world can never forget, and as long as some of us live we shall never let it forget, that memorable April day when, fearless and undaunted, he faced the frenzied hysteria of a war-maddened world and opposed our entrance into the World War. All honor to those brave souls who so fearlessly accepted their responsibilities on that dreadful day. Some of them are still with us—Senator NORRIS, of Nebraska, and two Members of this House, HAROLD KNUTSON and ERNEST LUNDEEN, of Minnesota. [Applause.] And I would feel that I had been ungenerous to the dead did I fail to mention the Honorable Claude Kitchin, who stood on the floor of this House 19 years ago and said:

It takes neither physical nor moral courage to vote for war which somebody else will have to fight.

Our task is to legislate for the welfare of our people. We approach that task conscientiously and with a high sense of duty. We apply ourselves diligently to the matter in hand and then pass such measures as we honestly and sincerely believe will help our beloved country. If we err we can remedy the mistake by repeal a few months later. But how irrevocable is a vote on war. Once declared war must be fought to the bitter end. There is no repeal.

The Moving Finger writes; and, having writ,  
Moves on: nor all your Piety nor Wit  
Shall lure it back to cancel half a line  
Nor all your tears wash out a word of it.

Thus spake the Persian poet, and uttered a great truth—a truth which applies to nothing in human affairs so overwhelmingly as to war.

And here is a strange fact in our political life. Our people may vote on public offices from the President down; they may vote on bond issues to finance local, county, and State affairs; they may express themselves on many social and political problems; but upon the most important and momentous crises—war—they have no voice. The people fight our wars; they pay for our wars; but they do not have the right to say whether or not there shall be a war. The people may mortgage themselves, their children, grandchildren, and great-grandchildren; they may shed their heart's blood on foreign soil; but why they are there or how they got there was never entrusted to their keeping. In our school days we learned that our independence was achieved with the slogan, "Taxation without representation is tyranny." Why should we feel that it is more important that the people have a voice in taxing a man's money than in taxing his life? Because I believe firmly that human life is more precious than property I am in favor of a referendum on war except in case of actual invasion. No one can deny the people's right to this vote, even if you do not want to trust them with it.

Congressman LUNDEEN, of Minnesota, conducted an interesting referendum in his district on the question of our entrance into the World War. You will find it one of the finest speeches I have ever read in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. This poll showed a vote of 8,000 opposed to war,

while less than 800 were for it. At Monroe, Wis., a vote was held, and the count showed, for peace 954, for war 95. There was also a Massachusetts referendum conducted by postal card. Of 20,000 postal cards which were sent out at the time we declared war, 66 percent of the answers were opposed to war.

The people showed better judgment than the Congress.

I am offering for your consideration the following amendment:

SECTION 1. Except in the event of an invasion of the United States or its territorial possessions and attack upon citizens residing therein, the authority of Congress to declare war shall not become effective until confirmed by a majority of all votes cast thereon in a Nation-wide referendum. Congress may by law provide for the enforcement of this section.

Full credit for this suggested addition to any neutrality legislation must go to one of our ablest and most conscientious Members, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW]. He has introduced a joint resolution, House Joint Resolution 167, to this effect, which I trust all of you will seriously consider.

#### LA FOLLETTE'S SPEECH

I have read again recently the speech of Wisconsin's greatest statesman, the late Robert M. La Follette. Time does not permit a dissertation on that able address, so I will ask your indulgence for only a few excerpts from his historic speech, delivered in the Senate of the United States, April 4, 1917:

We need not disturb ourselves because of what a minority may do. There is always lodged, and always will be, thank the God above us, power in the people supreme. Sometimes it sleeps, sometimes it seems the sleep of death; but, Sir, the sovereign power of the people never dies. It may be suppressed for a time; it may be misled, be fooled, silenced. I think, Mr. President, that it is being denied expression now. I think there will come a day when it will have expression.

What prophetic words in that last sentence! May I say to my departed friend, "Yes, Senator; the day has come when it will have expression." It is here now, and neutrality legislation must be the result. It is a melancholy fact that a militant, bulldozing majority may threaten and browbeat a weak minority into silence. This is a tragic truth in our democracy, for if ever there is a time when all sides to a question should be heard, when every thought and suggestion should be carefully weighed and considered, it should be when the black clouds of war hover over our people. Again I quote from the Senator's address:

I have said that with the causes of the present war we have nothing to do. That is true. We certainly are not responsible for it. It originated from causes beyond the sphere of our influence and outside the realm of our responsibility. It is not inadmissible, however, to say that no responsible narrator of the events which have led up to this greatest of all wars has failed to hold that the government of each country engaged in it is at fault for it. For my own part, I believe that this war, like nearly all others, originated in the selfish ambition and cruel greed of a comparatively few men in each government, who saw in war an opportunity for profit and power for themselves, and who are wholly indifferent to the awful suffering they knew that war would bring to the masses.

Today, 19 years since my Senator made that statement, we have spent \$125,000 to find out that he was right. The munitions inquiry has rendered a magnificent service to humanity in uncovering the truth. Let us hope that its findings are not written in sand. You mothers of the world, who have brought your little ones upon this earth in sorrow and in suffering, who have watched over them with infinite patience and tender care, will you forget? I place my hope for future generations in you, for men have signally failed to protect their own children.

The late Senator La Follette realized fully that not much faith could be placed in the belligerent nations across the Atlantic. He realized fully the perfidy and treachery practiced in international diplomacy, and, realizing that fact, he tried to safeguard our people from the snares and pitfalls of foreign intrigues. Again I quote:

The secret treaty between France and England for the partition of Morocco, while making a public treaty with Germany, the terms of which were diametrically opposite to those of the secret treaty, did much to arouse the suspicion and hostility of the German people toward both France and England.

I doubt if the diplomatic history of any of the nations of the earth in civilized times can show so reprehensible, so dishonest,

so perfused a record as the Moroccan affair brings home to the doors of those who were responsible for that Moroccan treaty, the diplomatic agents of the French and the English Governments.

Think of it, Mr. President! German citizens had acquired property as individual purchasers in the rich mineral fields of Morocco. A treaty was entered into between England, France, and Germany which protected all the interests of all those who signed the treaty. Then France and England executed a treaty, certain provisions of which were not published when the treaty was published.

By the terms of these secret provisions German enterprise was to be driven out of Morocco. Mark you, it was not the people of France and England—it was not even the governments of these respective countries—which were guilty of the great wrong committed against both Morocco and Germany, but less than a half dozen ambitious, intriguing diplomats, who made the secret plan to divide Morocco between France and Spain. Germany was to be thrown out. England backed up France and Spain in the disreputable deal and received for her part of the swag the relinquishment of France to all rights which she had theretofore claimed in Egypt. Herein history will find the real cause for this war. England would tolerate no commercial rivalry. Germany would not submit to isolation.

I repeat the Senator's words:

England would tolerate no commercial rivalry. Germany would not submit to isolation.

These then were the true causes of the World War. And to settle that question for England and Germany we sacrificed 130,447 American lives, wrecked the minds and bodies of over 200,000 more, and have burdened our people for generations to come with a tax load of \$100,000,000,000. And even that staggering figure does not include the awful wreckage of the depression, the major fault of which can be attributed to the World War. For depressions follow war as surely as night follows day. And no human mind with its imperfections and limitations can conceive of the cruel, brutal, devastating effect of the depression.

The Washington News had an editorial recently from which I quote briefly:

Walter Millis' *The Road to War* has just been widely read, refreshing America's memory of how the Sarajevo gunshot of 1914 had drawn all Europe into a bloody vortex into which a then isolated America had first thrown her goods and then her money and finally her manpower.

There you have the inevitable sequence—goods, money, men. The age-old fact of history—financial penetration followed by military intervention. Check the flow of money and you will check the flow of men.

I should love to pause to pay a passing tribute to our beloved leader, but I shall refrain in order that I may quote one of the finest things that was written about him. It is an editorial from the foremost liberal daily newspaper in the United States, the *Capital Times*, published at Madison, Wis. This tribute was written by its editor, the fearless, militant William T. Evjue, who faced boundless abuse, threats, and boycotts for asserting that La Follette was right.

#### WISCONSIN'S GREATEST SON

One little man, one lonely figure.

One little man—a 2-year target of one of the most terrific campaigns ever launched to destroy an individual; one human being, standing up against the angry roar of a war when a nation permitted hatred to take the seat of reason; one individual, drawing the attack of a national pulpit, press, and film; one fighter standing with his back to the wall and staying off the avalanche which the tremendous power of organized wealth is able to let loose.

Odds? Were odds ever greater against one man?

Standing at the end of 2 years in which he has borne a load such as few men could carry; maligned and misrepresented for many weary months; compelled to hold his ground practically alone, vindication has finally come to Wisconsin's greatest son, Robert M. La Follette.

Last Tuesday the sons of Wisconsin used that great instrument of democracy, the ballot, and in no uncertain terms they gave Senator La Follette a personal endorsement such as but few men fighting alone have ever received.

Two years ago there were but few men who had the courage to stand with Wisconsin's little giant. The enemies of democracy had so effectively employed the passion and hatred and hysteria of war against him that the man who refused to denounce La Follette as an enemy of this country was given the badge of disloyalty.

Reactionary enemies of the Senator's who seized the places of power in the conduct of the war proceeded immediately to use their vast powers to destroy the Senator and his friends.

A great university, to whose upbuilding no man had made a greater contribution than Senator La Follette, witnessed the spectacle of its faculty besmirching the name of the greatest alumnus Wisconsin ever turned out.

It was in this State that La Follette reared a movement which was the greatest contribution of its kind to a democracy which spelled economic justice and in which humanity was placed above

property. And yet the legislature of this State was driven by the powers of wealth to join in the campaign to place La Follette forever outside the pale of good citizenship.

Social organizations, dominated by men who made millions out of the war, removed the Senator's name from their membership rolls.

The story is too recent for extended amplification. Wisconsin still has fresh in its mind the outrageous treatment that was accorded the bravest man who ever came from within her borders.

Meanwhile, during all these cruel months Senator La Follette was patiently biding his time. This campaign of calumny was only new to the Senator because of its increased ferocity. For 25 years the Senator had been withstanding the attacks of privilege and wealth in every conceivable form.

He knew back of this campaign his old enemies were pulling the wires and directing the moves by which it was planned to encompass his downfall. He knew the real reasons that compelled the cowardly editors of the State to join in the united chorus against the Senator. He knew only too well the manner in which the editorial pages of this country respond to the wishes of organized wealth.

La Follette knew, too, that the people of this State would ultimately see through the campaign. He was content, therefore, to go along and await the final verdict of the people.

That verdict has come, and what an overwhelming answer it is to those who took part in the campaign to destroy Wisconsin's greatest son.

One little man—one lonely figure. He is a little over 5 feet tall. What little he has of worldly goods is mortgaged. He is small in stature and he is poor. And one man beats the combined power of the millions in wealth in this State; he beats the combined power of a press which stopped at nothing to smash him; he beats the combined assault of privilege and wealth single-handed and alone.

The pages of Wisconsin history are filled with the deeds of her illustrious sons. But none can be more dramatic or inspiring than the page that was written last Tuesday.

#### NEUTRALITY

What is neutrality? The dictionary defines it as "the state or fact of taking no part with either side in a controversy." Congress defined it legally as a foreign policy in these words:

Joint resolution providing for the prohibition of the export of arms, ammunition, and implements of war to belligerent countries; the prohibition of the transportation of arms, ammunition, and implements of war by vessels of the United States for the use of belligerent states; for the registration and licensing of persons engaged in the business of manufacturing, exporting, or importing arms, ammunition, or implements of war; and restricting travel by American citizens on belligerent ships during the war.

Unfortunately this act expires February 29, 1936. This act specifically provides that upon the outbreak of hostilities between two or more foreign powers, the President shall proclaim that fact; furthermore, that he shall by proclamation definitely enumerate the arms, ammunitions, or implements of war, which shall be subject to a licensing by the National Munitions Control Board. These provisions were mandatory, but the resolution left to the discretion of the President the declaring of an embargo on so-called "contraband commodities"; that is, oil, cotton, copper, wheat, and so forth.

This resolution was a compromise measure aimed to satisfy or pacify various differing groups in the Senate and the House.

#### PROCLAMATION

In pursuance of the mandates of the joint resolution of Congress, President Roosevelt issued a proclamation on October 5, 1935, admonishing all citizens of the United States to abstain from traveling on any vessel of either of the belligerent nations and, furthermore, in pursuance of the same resolution, President Roosevelt on the same day also proclaimed that a state of war existed between Ethiopia and the Kingdom of Italy, and admonished our citizens not to violate the congressional resolution by exporting arms, ammunition or implements of war. Then follows a list of articles within the scope of the joint resolution: Rifles and guns, ammunition, grenades, tanks, vessels of all kinds, including aircraft carriers and submarines, serial gun mounts, torpedo carriers, revolvers and automatic pistols, propellers, fuselages, aircraft engines, flame throwers, projectors, mustard and other gasses.

This list is by no means complete, but it is a beginning. The next step must include an embargo on the articles necessary to make these things and also the loans and credits necessary to buy them.

What is the necessity for this legislation? It is an effort to prevent our participation in another world war. Many of us believe that our free institutions could never stand the

strain of another world war; many of us believe that western civilization would be wiped out; many of us believe that occidental ideals would perish and be succeeded by oriental ideals. The ends achieved by such a conflict would not be commensurate to the cost. The price is too great.

As Mr. JOHNSON of Texas said in the House on August 23, 1935:

The prevention of war is one of the highest duties that government owes to society, and any nation that will not take every precaution and use every legitimate means to avert the holocaust of war is unworthy to stand among civilized nations of the world.

It is noticeable that this compromise measure omitted one of the outstanding provisions that I feel should be in the bill; that is, the provision denying credit or loans by citizens of this country to governments engaged in war. I believe that the extending of credit to belligerent nations by private citizens of the United States was one of the principal reasons for involving us in the World War. My reason for making such a statement is the letter of Secretary Lansing to President Wilson in 1917:

The difficulty is—and this is what Secretary McAdoo came to see me about—that the Government early in the war announced that it considered "war loans" to be contrary to the "true spirit of neutrality."

A declaration to this effect was given to the press by Secretary Bryan August 15, 1914. His exact language is as follows:

In the judgment of this Government loans by American bankers to any foreign nation at war is inconsistent with the true spirit of neutrality.

Similar statements were repeated subsequently, while private bankers were giving loans to belligerents with which to finance munitions purchases. These loans grew rapidly, and in time Secretary Lansing informed President Wilson that he was embarrassed by this earlier declaration of policy by Secretary Bryan.

To quote from the remarks of Senator BONE on August 20, 1935:

Secretary Lansing, who was probably one of the Nation's ablest officials, describes the mushroom growth of war purchases by belligerents, with the consequence that the European governments would go bankrupt if they tried to pay for those purchases in gold. Any demand to make them pay in gold would result in an industrial depression in this country. The alternative to this foreign-made depression was for us to loan money to the belligerents. This had previously been declared to be "inconsistent with the true spirit of neutrality" by the Department of State. In view of our financial entanglement with Europe, this policy of neutrality was now "a source of embarrassment."

One month after this letter the first great Anglo-French loan of \$500,000,000 was floated by a syndicate headed by J. P. Morgan & Co. Other loans followed. Andre Tardieu, former Premier of France, commented that after these foreign loans had been floated "from that time on, whether desired or not, the victory of the Allies became essential to the United States."

Though our citizens did not know it and had no voice in the matter, we had ceased to be neutrals and had arrayed ourselves on the side of the Allies. Because of these facts, I believe that the prohibition of loans and credits by our citizens to belligerents is fully as essential as the prohibition of sale of munitions by our citizens to belligerents.

Let us take the case of the *Lusitania*. The sinking of this vessel by a German submarine off the coast of Ireland was one of the causes of war. Let us apply the main points sought in neutrality legislation to this case and see what the result would have been.

First. The *Lusitania* carried munitions of war in her hold, which would have been prohibited under our act.

Second. Those munitions were financed by loans from private banks in this country, which would have been prohibited.

Third. Citizens of this country were passengers on this ship, which was sailing in territory prescribed as war zone by the belligerents, which would have been prohibited.

The result would have been that either the *Lusitania* would have altered her plans or she could not have sailed at all.

## FREEDOM OF THE SEAS

Of course, it will be said that we are surrendering the freedom of the seas. For 150 years our policy consisted in the time-honored doctrine that the private citizen could sell what he wanted, where he wanted, and when he wanted, and that we should maintain a navy strong enough to back him up. We have heard plenty about "dollar diplomacy", "trade follows the flag", and that other false bromide, "a warship for every dollar invested abroad."

This last slogan has always impressed me as particularly cold-blooded. Why should you and I be compelled to pay for battleships, man them with our sons, and send them to China because John Smith invested a lot of money there? To me it just does not make sense. And yet that is exactly the foreign policy to which we have adhered during our existence—first financial penetration, succeeded by military intervention. I am convinced that this policy has been a failure and that it has resulted directly in involvement in war instead of prevention. Therefore I feel that we must adopt a new policy and avoid the mistakes of the past. To continue as we have in the past is like drinking typhoid-contaminated water and saying we must not boil it because it would injure the medical profession.

Three well-known formulas have been advocated and tried out:

First. League of Nations.

Second. Sanctions.

Third. Neutrality legislation.

Let us consider these in turn.

## THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS

The League of Nations has not been accepted by our citizens or the United States Senate. Its critics point out its failure in the Chaco, Manchukuo, and Ethiopia. The most powerful nations have flouted it with impunity, and the League has been helpless to do anything about it. Personally I have no faith in the League because I have no faith in the membership composing the League. I cannot advise my countrymen to join a copartnership of which I am suspicious. Personally, I would never join a partnership, the other members of which broke their solemn oaths without any qualms, and repudiated their debts with clear conscience. No lawyer would advise his client to choose partners who were known to be liars and cheats, who refused to pay what they owed him, and who wasted all they earned on fancy firearms instead of applying that money on their debts.

## SANCTIONS

Sanctions are now being applied to Italy as a punitive measure to bring pressure to bear on her to cease the Ethiopian invasion. We are invited to join in these sanctions. What are they? Merely embargoes on trade with Italy. A penalty applied to Italy's commerce. How far have these sanctions gone? To date they have merely been applied to munitions, which Italy cares nothing about. The rub will come when sanctions are applied to so-called "contraband commodities", as oil, cotton, copper, and so forth. Foreign nations are hesitating to do this, because it may be interpreted as a hostile act and lead to war. England and France are attempting to avert this drastic step by holding out to Mussolini the juicy bait of the partitioning of Ethiopia.

Our people must not be embroiled in such international intrigue.

I am opposed to joining foreign nations in applying sanctions first, because you must sit in judgment on the conduct of a foreign power; and then having found it to be guilty of aggression, apply a penalty. This is assuming the role of a prosecutor, jury, judge, and jailor, all in one, which I do not favor. It means acting as the monitor of the conduct of other nations, which could easily involve us in endless foreign entanglements, which is just the thing we want to avoid. Another reason for opposing this method is because the effectiveness of sanctions depends entirely upon the whole-hearted cooperation of other nations. This you never get. The lure of profits, the fear of reprisals, economic necessity, and other reasons always keep some nations trading with the aggressor nation. And last, but not least, I would not care to place my trust in those whom I knew to be untrustworthy.

## NEUTRALITY LEGISLATION

Neutrality legislation remains as a solution to be tried, but not yet definitely proven. It rests upon the simple theory that the way to stay out of a fight is not to get into it. This is to be accomplished by making our citizens keep their hands off belligerents with both goods and money.

News dispatches emanating from Washington would indicate that the State Department does not approve of the restrictions upon so-called contraband commodities, but it could have a more elastic regulation that could be adjusted to meet changing conditions—such a policy would not be neutral but could and would be made partisan, and, therefore, it ought to be rejected.

Am I therefore so fatuous and ingenuous that I believe by passing neutrality legislation we will never again have a war? By no means. Such legislation accomplishes two purposes—(1) it serves notice on war makers that there will be nothing in it for them, and (2) it is a preventive measure which will minimize our chances of becoming involved.

The causes of war are nearly always economic. Knowing this to be a fact, what can we do about it? It occurs to me that we might create some form of international money that would simplify trade between countries and establish better relations.

It is a hopeful sign that thoughtful men and women everywhere are seeking a solution for this most difficult problem. On one point we are all agreed. No amount of profit can compensate the lives of our boys and girls, and never will we permit them to be sacrificed except it be in defense of our homes to repel an invader.

After all, our main objective is self-preservation. As Rousseau said in his Social Contract, chapter V:

The social treaty has as its end the preservation of the contracting parties. He who desires the end also desires the means, and some risks, even some losses, are inseparable from these means.

Rousseau also said in chapter II:

All men being born free and equal alienate their liberty only for their own advantage.

These truths of the great Frenchman are squarely in point. If we would enjoy immunity from foreign entanglements, we must be prepared to give up something. What shall we give up? War profits, of course. That term "war profits" is a misnomer, because there are no profits in war—not for the great mass of people. The only dividends of war ever declared for their benefit are misery and despair.

## COST OF WAR

Mr. John T. Flynn, one of the most prominent writers on economics of the present day, had a very interesting article in the Washington News recently. It was The Cost of War, Past and Present.

In the year 1929 to 1930—

Says Mr. Flynn—

the Federal Government spent in round numbers \$4,000,000,000. Of this huge sum we spent \$2,225,646,000 on war—past wars, future wars. This was for the Army and Navy, pensions, interest on war debts, and retirement of the war debt. In other words, out of every one of Uncle Sam's dollars spent in the fiscal year 1929-30 we spent 55.7 cents for war. This left only 44.3 cents for all the other expenses of the Government.

In the last fiscal year, ending June 30, 1935, the ordinary expenses of the Government were \$3,621,000,000. Of this sum \$2,300,000,000 was for war—61 cents out of every dollar paid by the taxpayer. For the coming year the best estimate that the departments can make at this time is that there will be a total expenditure of \$7,850,000,000. Of this amount, the Budget shows that as it stands there is a billion for national defense, \$790,000,000 for veterans' benefits and administration, and about \$900,000,000 for retirement and interest on the war debt. Add two billion for bonus and you will have a total of \$4,600,000,000—about 60 cents out of every dollar. Do you think war is worth it?

## OPPORTUNITY

The question now squarely before us is: Shall we continue the same blundering, muddling, foolish course that involved us in the World War, or shall we forsake that policy of destruction and turn to a new policy learned from the great lessons of the great disaster? For my part, I am ready and eager to accept the challenge. Let us cast out fear and face the issue. This is a glorious opportunity. Permit me to quote from the poem of that name by Edward Rowland Sill:

## OPPORTUNITY

This I beheld, or dreamed it in a dream:  
There spread a cloud of dust along a plain;  
And underneath the cloud, or in it, raged  
A furious battle; and men yelled, and swords  
Shocked upon swords and shields. A prince's banner  
Wavered, then staggered backward, hemmed by foes.  
A craven hung along the battle's edge,  
And thought, "Had I a sword of keener steel—  
That blue blade that the king's son bears—but this  
Blunt thing!"—he snapt and flung it from his hand,  
And lowering crept away and left the field.  
Then came the king's son, wounded, sore bestead,  
And weaponless, and saw the broken sword,  
Hilt-buried in the dry and trodden sand,  
And ran and snatched it, and with battle-shout  
Lifted afresh he hewed his enemy down,  
And saved a great cause that heroic day.

Would that God would give us the strength and understanding to protect those who are so dependent upon us. [Applause.]

Mr. PARKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I have asked the indulgence of the committee at this time to discuss for a few moments what I consider to be a most distressing and alarming situation. I refer to the proposed serious curtailment of the Civilian Conservation Corps that is now in the making. As most of you know, the order is now out to abandon nearly 700 C. C. C. camps on April 1, making all told 1,000 camps to be abandoned from January 1 to April 1. It is proposed that the personnel of these camps be cut from 500,000 to 300,000 in the name of economy.

It will be recalled that these camps were established under very trying circumstances. When the President suggested that such camps be established in every State in the Nation for worthy but unemployed young men who were tramping the highways and byways looking for jobs, his political enemies scoffed at the idea. Enemies of the New Deal not only scoffed at the establishment of C. C. C. camps throughout the Nation, but the movement was ridiculed and criticized severely by those who have been unwilling to believe that anything good could come from the Roosevelt administration.

Many will also recall that the establishment of the Civilian Conservation camps were at first the butt of jokes and the enrollees were called "sapling setters", and someone said he would eat all the trees that were ever actually set out by these boys.

But how things have changed. Today no activity of the New Deal is more popular than are the C. C. C. camps. In fact, they are almost universally praised. Many of the critics of the New Deal reluctantly admit that the C. C. C. camps have justified their existence. More than 500,000,000 trees had been planted by the enrollees up until September 1, 1935.

In the State of Oklahoma there are now 24 soil conservation camps functioning in a highly efficient manner under the able leadership of Dr. N. E. Winters, regional director of soil conservation for Oklahoma, Kansas, and Nebraska. I have spoken on the floor of this House several times with reference to the Soil Conservation Service alone. It is suffice to say that no Member of this House would question the fact that the soil conservation camps, as well as the Soil Conservation Service, have justified their existence.

There are also about 20 Park, Forest, and Biological Survey camps in Oklahoma. In fact, the C. C. C. camps under the various activities have given a splendid account of themselves in Oklahoma, and I am sure the same is true in every section of the country.

Not only have these camps conserved the soil, the forest, and protected wildlife, and transformed wildernesses into areas of wondrous beauty, but the Civilian Corps activity has rendered its greatest service in building up the morale of the young manhood of America. It has by its far-reaching program and splendid training given hundreds of thousands of desperately needy and deserving young men a new lease on life.

Originally it was planned that 600,000 young men would be enrolled in these camps, but because of impractical, foolish, and unreasonable rules inaugurated, requiring that before any young man was eligible to be enrolled, that his parents had to be actually on relief, the number of enrollees never reached the 600,000 mark that was anticipated. In August 1935 the peak enrollment was 506,000 in the camps in the United States, aside from approximately 11,000 Indians, who were enrolled in the same work, but a majority of whom lived at home. Add to this number the C. C. C. camps in Puerto Rico, Hawaii, and Alaska and we had enrolled at the peak approximately 520,000 enrollees for the United States and its Territories. All told 1,500,000 young men have gone through the C. C. C. camps, of which 134,000 have quit to accept jobs.

At its peak we had more than 2,400 camps throughout the Nation. Then, like a clap of thunder from a clear sky, came the order abolishing 1,000 of these camps with one fell swoop in the name of economy. We are told that private industry will absorb 200,000 of the 500,000 enrollees in the next 6 months, even though it has only absorbed 134,000 of the one and one-half millions of these enrollees who have gone through these camps during the past 2 years. It is a compliment to the C. C. C. camps that private industry has employed 134,000 of them. It is certain that not one of them ever secured a job in a private business that did not have a good, clean record as an enrollee in the camp.

But I submit that it is unreasonable to expect private industry to absorb so many young men with the unemployment as acute as it now is. Do you know that technical experts have said that the value of the work already done is more than \$500,000,000? So I say to you that if any part of the New Deal can be justified, and it can be, certainly the Civilian Conservation Corps camps can be justified from every standpoint. Yet we are told in no uncertain terms that 1,000 camps in all are to be abandoned by April 1.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. MASSINGALE. The gentleman, I am sure, has observed the work that has been done and is now being done in Oklahoma by the C. C. C. camps. I would like him to give his opinion to this House of the result of the abolition of the C. C. C. camps on the present program of farm relief we expect to be enacted into law, based on the soil-conservation idea.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has assigned me quite a task, and I have not time here to go into details; but I will say that the people of Oklahoma are strong for soil conservation; and the elimination of 10 or a dozen soil-conservation camps April 1 would be demoralizing. The State of Oklahoma had at first some 49 C. C. C. camps. Five of those camps have been abandoned. The camps had been established at a cost of from \$17,000 to \$18,000 each. These abandoned camps stand there like beacon lights to the enemy to say, "Look at the extravagance of the New Deal", and you cannot blame them. It is unjustifiable, it is inexcusable, and nobody can defend such reckless foolishness as abandoning camps that cost \$18,000 each. If on April 1, 700 more are to be abandoned, as now planned, I will say to my colleague from Oklahoma that no less than 10 will be soil-erosion camps in Oklahoma, so I am advised.

Personally I do not want to see one of those camps abandoned, but to thus cripple the great soil-erosion program as would follow the closing of so many camps is, I repeat, inexcusable.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. ANDRESEN. In connection with the C. C. C. camps doing erosion work we find that the organization has signed up a good many projects and promised producers that these projects would be completed. We find that all over the country they are abandoning camps, abandoning projects that had been promised the farmers in the various sections,

and the farmers are greatly disappointed. They are disappointed on account of the waste of money in abandoning these camps that have been built up, and they are disappointed that promises should be made to the farmers to carry on the work and that those promises are now to be unfulfilled.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes; I will be glad to yield to our distinguished floor leader.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I am not critical of the gentleman's attitude, but, as a matter of fact, when the C. C. C. camps were established in a great many communities they had certain allotted work to do. There was forest work, road work, trail work, soil-erosion work, and so on. When they have completed their activities in that section there is no necessity for them keeping the camp at that particular place, and it is necessary to abandon it, is it not?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I agree with the gentleman that when a job is completed then the work certainly ought to be abandoned at that particular place, but not until that time. I can give the distinguished floor leader many examples of where orders were issued to abandon a camp right in the middle of a project. Camps, I am ashamed to say, were ordered abandoned before they had hardly begun in many instances. I hold in my hand a clipping from the El Reno American, one of the largest and most widely read weekly newspapers published in Oklahoma. The story and pictures appear on the front page of that publication. Here is a picture of a camp established in Canadian County, Okla., at a cost of more than \$18,000. It had been established only 6 months. Below the picture of the abandoned camp is that of a dam, half completed—work done by the C. C. C. boys. With only a few days' notice, this camp was abandoned, and the headline at the top of this paper says in bold letters, "Uncle Sam's bad investment." After 6 months' excellent work, after just getting under way, and with a splendid program outlined, Uncle Sam abandons an \$18,000 camp in the name of economy. And the Congressman from that district will be expected to defend such a policy. Well, for my part I do not propose to do it. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

Mr. BOLTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. BOLTON. I do not know whether the gentleman is aware of the fact that several of these camps have been abandoned before they have been occupied, as a matter of fact. What does the gentleman suggest? How is he going to continue these camps if there is not sufficient money appropriated or allocated for the purpose? The President has indicated he wants to cut down the C. C. C. activities. Therefore it must follow that certain camps must be abandoned.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is the purpose of my speaking to you this afternoon. We know that only recently \$364,000,000 were allocated to Dr. Tugwell for his Resettlement Administration, that, so far as Oklahoma is concerned, has been woefully disappointing. I say to you that funds for C. C. C. camp activities should be earmarked if there is any justification for earmarking funds for Dr. Tugwell's Resettlement Administration. [Applause.]

Mr. BIERMANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. BIERMANN. I agree with the idea the gentleman is advancing, but is it not a fact that the cutting down of those camps is due to the fact that the law provides that the enrollees have to be taken from families who are on relief, and as times have gotten better, there are not so many families on relief and there is not the possible number of enrollees?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Oh, the gentleman has hit the nail on the head. Oh, yes. Times have gotten better. There is no question about that. But it is a foolish and

ridiculous rule that these boys must be taken from the relief rolls. I mentioned that rule a while ago. It is just an arbitrary rule and it ought to be modified. There are hundreds and thousands of young men in every State in the Union who are clamoring to get into these camps, and who have been unable to do so because, perchance, their fathers and mothers have not yet gone on relief. I agree that the camps were for those who needed jobs, who wanted to work, but by requiring that their mothers and fathers must be on relief, they have done an injustice to the boys, and it was impossible to make the enrollment 600,000 as was first decided upon. However, let me remind Members that there are more than 300 camps in the United States now standing like signboards on the highways and byways, "This is what the New Deal established. This is what the New Deal abandoned. This is Uncle Sam's bad investment." There is no justification for it. It is time this Congress asserted itself. It is time the Members of this Congress should say if these C. C. C. camps could justify their existence, then they certainly ought to be continued until the job is finished. [Applause.]

Mr. MASSINGALE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I will be glad to yield again to my colleague from Oklahoma.

Mr. MASSINGALE. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] asked the gentleman a question to the effect if he did not think those camps should be abandoned where they have completed the work. I want to ask the gentleman if he has not observed that, as far as Oklahoma is concerned, the C. C. C. camps have not really started to work?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. The gentleman is correct. They have merely touched the surface. We could use several times the number of camps in my State, especially the soil erosion camps, and still it would require years to do the soil conservation job that has been undertaken.

Mr. HAINES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. HAINES. I am very much interested in the gentleman's statement, because I have a number of these camps in my own district.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I will say to my friend he will not have after the 1st of April, unless Congress does something affirmatively about it, and does so quickly.

Mr. HAINES. As I understand, there are about 300 members in a camp.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. No; there were originally about 200 enrollees. But each C. C. C. camp in the United States had its personnel cut to 184 enrollees. Thus the overhead of the camps of 184 is equal to that of a 200-man camp. In fact, I am reliably and officially informed that the overhead of a camp of 200 men would be practically the same as for a 150-man camp.

Mr. HAINES. That will call for throwing 150,000 young men back home on relief, will it not?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes; they will be back on relief or walking the streets and highways and byways looking for a job as they were doing before they got into these camps.

Mr. HAINES. Would it not be wiser financially to permit these boys to do this construction work in these camps rather than to send them back home and give them a dole?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Certainly. That is what I am pleading for today. That is what this Congress ought to insist upon being done.

Mr. HAINES. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. We ought not to stand idly by and permit 700 camps to be abandoned April 1. You will recall that the order abandoning 1,000 camps was first made to become effective January 1. The original plans were to abandon all of the 1,000 camps January 1. I came here the latter part of November to be at the hearings of the Appropriations Committee December 3. When I heard this I protested to Mr. Fechner; I protested to everyone I thought possibly would have any effect on the situation, but got nowhere. We were told it was absolutely impossible; that nothing could be done about it—that the order was out, the

orders were out, and they were going to be abandoned anyway.

Some of us felt justified in carrying our protests to a still higher authority. It is sufficient to say that finally the order was modified, and only 300 of these camps were actually abandoned January 1. So this April 1 order is merely a postponement of the death sentence that was ordered for a thousand C. C. C. camps January 1.

Considering the fine record made by these camps throughout the country, considering the thousands of families it has helped tide over during these cold winter months, and also what the C. C. C. has done in building the morale of the 1,500,000 young men, I say it is our solemn duty at this time to use every effort possible to prevent the abandonment of these camps on April 1 and thus permit 700 more vacant camp sites to stand there idle, like signboards saying to the passers-by, "Look at the extravagance of the New Deal; look at Uncle Sam's bad investment."

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. CULKIN. The gentleman is making a very interesting speech.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CULKIN. And may I add I endorse heartily the gentleman's suggestion that some way ought to be found by which this money now allocated to Dr. Tugwell in the sum of \$350,000,000 may be recaptured and taken away from boondoggling efforts and applied to this real humane purpose of continuing these C. C. C. camps.

[Here the gavel again fell.]

Mr. PARKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Let me say in closing that I have no desire to detain you longer. But it occurs to me that if the Congress of the United States desires to do so it can find a way to keep these camps open. Not only should existing camps be kept open but the 300 camps that have been abandoned should be reoccupied without delay. As one member of the Appropriations Committee, let me say that when another public-works program comes to Congress—and I understand one will be on the way before long—I give notice now that I expect to insist on earmarking sufficient funds to keep every C. C. C. camp in the United States open. And not only that but to reopen the ones that have been closed. It is my sincere hope that Members of this House will join in this fight and give the C. C. C. camps a square deal under the New Deal. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, as a general thing when a Member comes into the well of the House and speaks about the responsibility of Congress it is a fine bit of fancy phraseology that we do not often take seriously. There has, however, been reposed upon the Seventy-fourth Congress not an abstract responsibility but a very personal responsibility by a resolution that was passed last year.

On the 23d day of August 1935 the Seventy-fourth Congress passed Resolution No. 350, staying the deportation of 2,862 individuals until the 1st of March 1936. Substantially, in 20 days, unless this Congress makes up its mind what it intends to do, not even the President of the United States can stop the sending of 2,862 people out of this country. When they are sent away they will leave 6,389 near relatives. Of this number 4,400 are citizens of the United States of America.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let me finish first, please; then I shall be pleased to yield.

A great many of these near relatives, a great many of these 4,400 are minors who will be deposited upon the relief rolls of the United States of America, and we have got from now until the 1st day of March to discharge not a general responsibility but a very personal responsibility. I am sure I am at a loss about the matter, even though I happen to be a member of the Committee on Immigration and Naturaliza-

tion, because I have seen one after another of the bills that have been reported out of that committee die through objection to their consideration when the Consent Calendar was called.

It may be interesting for the Members of the House to know that of the 2,862 who will be sent away on the 1st day of March despite any effort that may be made by any Federal court or any administrative officer, 59 percent have been here, as I recall, for more than 10 years; 34 percent have been here for more than 5 years; and 7 percent have been here under 5 years. It may be interesting to know also that over 1,800 of the 2,862, or substantially 66 percent, have never been on relief, have never been public charges, and have no police records. It may be interesting to know further that 17 percent have had slight relief, and no police records; and only 4 percent have had police records involving minor misdemeanors and no moral turpitude.

Through Resolution No. 350, passed on the 23d day of August last year, we have virtually served notice upon the Commissioner General of Immigration not to deport these people until the Congress of the United States can examine the reports and determine for itself what it is going to do. There is a complete file, there is an individual and personal analysis of every case now filed with the chairman and the clerk of the House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. Do I understand that under existing law these 2,862 people are subject to deportation except for the passage of the resolution of the last Congress?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Exactly.

Mr. MAPES. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. MAPES. The gentleman states that there is no hand which can stay the deportation of these 2,862 individuals, not even the President of the United States, unless the Congress acts. As a matter of fact, has not the hand of the Department stayed deportation for a period of something like 2 or 3 years, notwithstanding that the law requires their deportation? Is it not also true that the resolution to which the gentleman refers is not a resolution of the Congress but merely a resolution of the House of Representatives which in effect says that the majority of the House of Representatives approves of the action of the Bureau of Immigration in refusing to deport these men according to law? Is this not a proper statement?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think technically the statement is correct.

Mr. MAPES. And does not the gentleman overstate the fact when he says that no hand can do it and when he intimates that this resolution had any effect in law?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The discretion of the Secretary of Labor goes only so far as fixing the actual date for deportation. These cases will have to be deported. That has been settled. It is only a question now of determining the date of deportation.

Mr. MAPES. But their deportation has been detained now for something over 2 years without any change in the law.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes; and the Congress of the United States can continue that situation, of course, by further resolution; but in view of the fact that there has been a settled determination here, I should say, to carry on a restrictive policy with which I am substantially in accord, of course, it appears to me under such circumstances these people are going to have to be sent out, irrespective of the merits of the cases involved.

Mr. MAPES. I do not care to argue with the gentleman, but I thought his statement might be just a little misleading as to the technical situation.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is possibly very true.

Mr. MAPES. Is it not true the resolution which the House of Representatives passed in August, but not the Senate, had no effect in law whatever?

Mr. DIRKSEN. It had a certain effect. It must be remembered that this thing is being administered by our Commissioner General on Immigration. We cannot go on and throw rocks at the Commissioner for being lax in his deportation policy and we cannot throw rocks at the Department of Labor because they are allowing people to come in and not sending enough people out without making the Department of Labor very definitely amenable to what the Congress wants. How can they do other than to carry out that policy, even though the gentleman from Michigan is technically correct?

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. The gentleman, I understood, agreed that under the existing law of the land, which Congress has passed, these 2,862 people are subject to deportation. It seems to me that you really have a greater point involved than merely 2,862 people being deported, and that is whether or not the law of the land will be maintained.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is exactly the question, whether these 2,862 individuals under existing law, irrespective of the merits of the cases, are going to be sent out.

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. Congress never went into the individual cases at all.

Mr. DIRKSEN. This is the first time.

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. The only remedy there is now is to present legislation. The facts are that we have laws upon the books and a department of our Government has failed to carry the laws into execution for 2 or 3 years. Then we had this namby-pamby resolution of a past Congress, behind which one part of the executive branch is hiding. Of course, the gentleman will agree with me that the point involved is whether the law will be enforced. The only way to reach this question, if the gentleman determines to do it, is through amendment to the substantive law of the land.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I shall ask the gentleman to allow me to proceed from the point he is making.

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. If Congress does not do that, I do not think the gentleman can be critical.

[Here the gavel fell.]

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, there is pending before the Committee on Immigration at the present time a bill known as the Kerr bill, which undertakes to remedy this situation in part. It goes thoroughly into matters of immigration. Generally, I agree with some of the provisions of the bill, but not insofar as conferring discretion to an inter-departmental committee is concerned. I have some decided views about this matter. Perhaps that particular provision of the bill should be revised. However, the bill has been stymied in the committee; meanwhile the restrictionist element on the floor—and I say this with no malice or criticism at all, because I do believe that we ought to go in for restriction generally—has made it almost impossible to get proper consideration of an immigration bill. Nevertheless, we have 2,862 cases which we are going to have to dispose of one way or the other by legislation or by resolution of Congress directed to the Department of Labor or otherwise.

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. It seems to me that if the law is enforced the matter is disposed of.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I will get to that point. The question is whether the Congress under the circumstances, after the Commissioner General of Immigration has stayed deportation in these 2,862 cases, wants to go ahead and permit them to send these people out of the country, irrespective of the fact they are noncriminals; irrespective of the fact that we are going to leave approximately 4,400 people behind who are American citizens, out of a total of some 6,300 near relatives, almost 4,000 of which are going to be deposited on the relief rolls of the United States. That is another consideration.

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. Will the gentleman yield further?

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

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. The gentleman is making a very interesting statement, but may I ask, How many of these

minors will stay here, and how many will go with their parents to their real home?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Permit me to finish, and I believe I can get over to the gentleman what I have in mind.

I said that 59 percent of these people had been here over 10 years, and 34 percent of them over 5 years, and by sending these 2,862 people out you are going to disintegrate and dismember a great many families, of whom 4,665 are American citizens at the present time.

Now, think of the futility of sending these people out of the country, because if they have kinfolks and families here they can qualify under the quota numbers that run to any country with which the United States has an arrangement under the National Origins Act, and they can get a non-quota status or a preferential quota status and in a year's time can be back in the country.

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. And if they can get such a quota status, that keeps somebody else from coming in under the same status. The gentleman is always convincing, and the heart appeal, of course, is handled splendidly by him—

Mr. DIRKSEN. Never mind about the heart appeal; I am interested in the injustice of sending these people out of the country.

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. But when the gentleman appeals to the House and talks about the pulling of the heart-strings and about the father being separated from the child, I know the gentleman recognizes the fact that if one of these aliens has violated the law and is sent to the penitentiary, or if a citizen of the United States violates the law and is sent to the penitentiary, there is a pulling on the heartstrings of the wife and children, and oftentimes there is real suffering.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Instead of the gentleman making a speech in my time, let me ask the gentleman this question: Are you in favor of sending these 2,862 people out of the country when their 4,400 dependents are citizens of the United States of America, and 4,000 of them are going to be placed upon the relief rolls because the bread winner of the family has been sent out of the country, although he can come back in a year, which indicates the futility of the thing.

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. I will answer the gentleman and say "yes", because I have sat at his feet and I have listened to his resonant oratory, but I love my country, the Constitution, and the law of my country, just like the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The gentleman from Kentucky and I just do not see eye to eye on this matter.

This is not a question of what our future policy shall be. It is a question of whether we are going to dismember these families at the present time, and you can put it on the line that the Commissioner General is going to send these people out unless the Congress takes some action. This action may very well be embodied in a bill that is in the committee at the present time, but which has not been reported out because of an adverse report; moreover, what good would it do to bring it out on the floor if every immigration bill and every naturalization bill, just because it has the name of being an immigration bill or a naturalization bill, is going to have its head chopped off when it comes before the House for unanimous-consent consideration?

[Here the gavel fell.]

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

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MILLARD. Is the gentleman in favor of the Kerr bill? Did the gentleman vote for that measure?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am in favor of some provisions of the Kerr bill.

Mr. MILLARD. But the gentleman is opposed to most of them?

Mr. DIRKSEN. And, if the gentleman will permit, I may say that he knows as well as I that when a man is convicted of an offense under a State law pertaining to narcotics he cannot be deported. On the other hand, if he violates the Federal Narcotic Act he can be deported. Certainly the gen-

leman from New York knows as well as I do that if you steal a little toy to give to your child, or a loaf of bread, it is a crime involving moral turpitude, for which you can be deported, and yet the gangsters in Philadelphia and Chicago and New York and Cleveland and elsewhere can carry concealed weapons and be convicted time and time again, and yet you cannot send them out of the country because that does not involve moral turpitude.

We talk about smuggling on the Canadian border and the Mexican border, but the singular thing about that law at the present time is that the wily person who smuggles Chinamen and others into the country cannot be deported, although the person who is smuggled in is an illegal entrant and can be deported.

I mention this to indicate what the loopholes are in the law at the present time, and some portions of the Kerr bill undertake to close these loopholes and give us a more satisfactory immigration law.

The gentleman will agree with me that the only difficulty, the only point of discord, and the only point about which we have not been able to reach an agreement is on conferring discretionary authority upon the Department of Labor or an interdepartmental committee with respect to deportation.

Mr. MILLARD. Which we thought was very dangerous.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But despite all that, we can bring out some satisfactory kind of bill so as to cover this situation and also take some action upon the 2,862 cases pending at the present time.

I shall not try to persuade this House to any course of action. I simply deposit the problem right on the doorstep of the House and say there are 2,862 cases with 6,400 dependents, 4,500 of whom are American citizens, 4,000 of whom will land on the relief rolls if you send the bread-winners back to their own countries for some little infraction of law, noncriminal in character. Do you want to send them out of the country or do you not? I think this is a personal responsibility of the Congress because the gentleman who administers that section of the Department of Labor is going to be deferential to the wishes of the Congress. And when we keep on throwing brickbats at him constantly he will say, "I will end the problem forthwith, and just chuck them out of the country."

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. EKWALL. I should like to know why these various people are deportable. What is the situation? Did they come in here illegally?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I suppose 98 percent of them are illegal entrants.

Mr. EKWALL. Then, why should they not be deported?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let the gentleman answer that question himself.

Mr. EKWALL. No; the gentleman is up here talking about it and asking us for something.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am stating the problem. That is all.

Mr. EKWALL. That is the trouble in this country. We have allowed these people to come in here, and we have encouraged them by reason of soft soaping them after they come here.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Fifty-nine percent of them have been here over 10 years. They have married American citizens, and now you want to send them away. You answer the question personally. I will answer it for myself. It is your responsibility as well as mine.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. DONDERO. Does the gentleman not think that the damage done by the reverence for the law would be much greater than the injury done if their people and their relatives were deported?

Mr. DIRKSEN. It is not an abstract question. Suppose you were placed in the position of these people. Stop and think of it from the standpoint that there will be 4,500 American citizen dependents as a result of the 2,862 deportations, 4,000 of whom may become candidates for relief and become

public charges. It is no mere abstract question. It is a very vital, personal question.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. MAPES. The gentleman from Illinois, in answer to the inquiry of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. EKWALL], says that probably 98 percent of them have come in illegally, and that there would be separation between those illegal entrants and American citizens. Does the gentleman know how many of those who married these entrants did so with the full knowledge of their status, knowing they would have to be deported sooner or later? In other words, are there so many innocent people involved as the gentleman's statement might lead people to believe.

Mr. DIRKSEN. As a matter of fact, I suppose a great many of them knew they might be subject to deportation; but you leave behind a lot of innocent people who become the responsibility of the United States Government and of the States in which they live. So let every Member of this House answer the question for himself, because too often these matters do not receive any discussion or consideration at all when the Consent Calendar is called. They are knocked down by an objection, and the matter is never properly presented. I have taken this opportunity to present it as it is and throw it on the shoulders of every Member in the House individually. At this point I shall insert the full text of the resolution which was passed by the House last August.

#### House Resolution 350

Whereas during the past 2 years the Department of Labor has stayed the deportation of some 2,600 hardship cases of aliens technically subject to deportation whose deportation would involve the separation of many families, leaving approximately 7,000 dependent relatives here, of whom approximately 5,000 are wives and minor children, pending consideration by Congress of certain proposed legislation; and

Whereas the House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization on June 18, 1934, unanimously adopted a resolution urging the continued stay of deportation in such cases pending such time as the Congress required for a further opportunity to study the problem: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That in order that the Congress may have adequate time to consider the proposed legislation, the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization be requested to continue the stay of deportation until March 1, 1936, in the cases of aliens of good character, excepting those involving a question of moral turpitude, in which deportation would result in unusual hardship; and be it further

*Resolved*, That on or before January 15, 1936, the Commissioner submit to the Congress for its consideration a list of all cases, excepting those involving a question of moral turpitude, stayed up to and including December 31, 1935, and to submit a list of the names of all cases, together with the full and complete file of each name and case, and all facts pertaining to same.

Mr. Chairman, you will note by the terms of this resolution that the Congress has requested the Commissioner of Immigration to stay deportation in the case of aliens of good character, where no moral turpitude is involved, until the Congress has had opportunity for further study of the problem. This is the 10th day of February. That resolution will remain in effect until March 1. That is 20 days. The Commissioner has made his report as requested by the resolution. It involves, as I have stated, 2,862 cases, who, if deported, will leave behind 6,389 near relatives, 4,665 of whom are American citizens, of which number 3,994 are dependents, who will become public charges. They are noncriminal aliens. The resolution applies only to aliens of good character who have not been involved in offenses which embrace moral turpitude. Deportation is mandatory under existing law. The only discretion permitted the Secretary of Labor is as to the fixing of the time on which the deportation shall be made. The attitude of this Congress, as I have observed it, is for greater restriction because of our far-flung unemployment condition. I concur in that attitude. The immediate matter, however, does not concern itself so much with future policy as it does with these involved cases which will occasion the separation of families. The Congress can do one of several things. It can enact a resolution for a further stay of deportation in these cases. It can enact legislation conferring upon the Department of Labor discretionary authority in cases of this kind; I am satisfied that it

will never do that. It can take care of these instant cases by special enactment covering them. Or finally it can confer discretionary authority upon an interdepartmental committee from the Department of State and the Department of Labor to handle such cases. I doubt whether it would confer such authority. But in any event it is the responsibility of Congress, because we specifically requested the Commissioner of Immigration to stay deportation until March 1, 1936, and he has done so. The next move is up to Congress.

The Kerr bill, which failed to come out of the Immigration Committee, has a provision conferring discretionary authority upon the interdepartmental committee. That provision was the bone of contention. In other respects the bill has some excellent provisions, which will get at the 20,000 criminals who should be deported but cannot be under existing law, the mandatory deportation of those engaged in vending narcotics, the deportation of habitual criminals, the deportation of racketeers who carry concealed weapons and are convicted of so doing.

All that, however, is beside the point in dealing with the instant cases. If it is thumbs up on these 2,862 cases, they will stay. If it is thumbs down, it is up to the Department of Labor to proceed with deportation. Since they have families here and can, within a year, return under a nonquota or preferential quota status, I wonder if deporting them would not be a gesture and a bit of magnificent futility. They are not criminals within the meaning of existing immigration laws, and I know of nothing to prevent their return at the end of a year. Since they must be deported at Government expense, it looks like a year's vacation and an ocean trip for 2,862 people at the expense of Uncle Sam. It remains, however, a responsibility of the Congress. Someone might well say, "Why does not your committee do something about it?" The answer is that any legislation to cover it must come up under a special rule, by suspension, or by unanimous consent. Every Member of this House can testify as to what happened to many immigration bills which came up under suspension or on the Consent Calendar. They have about as much chance as the proverbial snowball. The committee is divided on the matter, and I, in conjunction with some of the members of that committee, have opposed bills that were reported favorably. So there you are, and when all is said and done, the question still remains, What will the Congress say to the Labor Department on March 1 with respect to these 2,862 cases? Of course, the Congress is not obligated to say anything and can let the matter go by default, in which event the deportations will be made. In any event, I have tried to do my duty by laying the substance of the Commissioner's report before the House for its consideration.

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

**MR. PARKS.** Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Hook].

**MR. HOOK.** Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, at this time I rise to call attention of the House to a situation in regard to the river and harbor appropriation. It seems that the Great Lakes region, where commerce and fishing is so extensive, has been completely forgotten.

I am going to call special attention to a project in the upper peninsula of Michigan, which is known as the Keweenaw waterway.

This project opens a waterway clear across a portion of the upper peninsula and serves as a harbor for vessels in times of storm. It also serves as a harbor for copper-ore vessels.

The traffic in the open lake passing Keweenaw Point averages 62,000,000 tons annually. This includes ore, wheat, and all other shipments. This project will afford shelter in storms and considerably shorten the down Lakes' route. It is very necessary to good navigation. This project has been approved by the War Department and has been approved by the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, but it has been given no status of an appropriation.

I also want to call attention to another project, the Presque Isle Harbor at Marquette, Mich.

In that connection I want to call attention to a letter that I received this morning from an Army engineer who has made a survey of this project, and in that letter he says:

Activities in the various harbors of your district during the coming season will depend upon the amount of funds made available. I have requested that \$575,000 be allotted for dredging and breakwater construction at Presque Isle Harbor (Marquette Bay) and \$1,300,000 for similar work in the Keweenaw waterway. No doubt the amount of money which the Chief of Engineers will be able to allot to these projects will depend upon the size of the lump-sum appropriation for rivers and harbors in the Army appropriation bill now pending.

In company with two of my colleagues, Mr. DONDERO and Mr. LESINSKI, we went down and conferred with the engineers of the War Department. I do not know as we were given much encouragement. I asked the question "Whether we could earmark this fund?" and he said, "Well, it has not been done for over 20 years."

I do not want to violate the precedents of the House or encourage the breaking of any rule established by usage, but I may say that if the Great Lakes region is going to be abandoned I am going to attempt, when the bill comes up, to earmark this fund in behalf of the Great Lakes region.

All we are asking for our section of the Great Lakes region is \$7,500,000. When we stop to think that—and I am not criticizing what is going to be done in other sections of the country—when we stop to think that \$143,000,000 is going to be spent on a canal across the great State of Florida, and about \$12,000,000 has been allotted for this year when only \$7,000,000 was asked, and we ask only for \$7,500,000, I think we are entitled to that fund for this section of the Great Lakes region.

**MR. BOLTON.** Will the gentleman yield?

**MR. HOOK.** I yield.

**MR. BOLTON.** Will the gentleman explain where he finds the item of \$7,500,000 for the Great Lakes region? Offhand, I can think of a great many more millions that have been authorized for the Great Lakes than seven and a half million.

**MR. HOOK.** That is true. I am taking the information from one of the district engineers, wherein he informed the Manistee Board of Commerce as follows:

The United States Chief of Engineers has requested an appropriation of \$209,000,000 for river and harbor work this coming year. The Budget Director has requested that appropriation be cut to \$129,000,000, and now a movement is under way to cut this appropriation to \$100,000,000.

He sets forth that the Budget Director, for rivers and harbors, has requested for the coming year the sum of \$129,000,000; and if we would endeavor to get and do get an additional amount, that \$7,500,000 could be allocated as has been requested by the engineers for this section of the Great Lakes. They would then be able to do something on the Great Lakes in behalf of navigation. I grant that we will need a lot more than that.

**MR. BOLTON.** Will the gentleman yield further?

**MR. HOOK.** I yield.

**MR. BOLTON.** I understand now where those figures came from, but may I say in that connection the list submitted by the Chief of Engineers, according to the Chief of Engineers, is rather elastic, and if he finds more is needed for one locality than the other he has a right to change it.

**MR. HOOK.** That is true.

**MR. BOLTON.** In other words, these items are not definitely earmarked.

**MR. HOOK.** That is true.

**MR. DONDERO.** Will the gentleman yield?

**MR. HOOK.** I yield.

**MR. DONDERO.** I think what we know now and what we did not know Saturday morning when we appeared before the Army engineers the fact that the \$12,000,000 intended to be included in this bill for the Florida Ship Canal has not been included in the report of the committee that has been submitted on the floor. I ask the chairman of the subcommittee if that is not correct?

**MR. PARKS.** Yes. It is not in this bill. It was approved by the Budget, but not authorized by Congress.

Mr. CULKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOOK. I yield.

Mr. CULKIN. Does the gentleman know that the threat to these funds consists in the application of these funds to P. W. A. projects which were started by "Honest Harold" Ickes without authority of Congress?

Mr. HOOK. I will come to that in just a minute. On the project known as the Marquette Bay project, that was estimated at \$79,000 plus. In the report of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors it was stated that \$75,000 was allotted by P. W. A. for that project. I find that is not true; that when the amount was applied for, our good friend Harry Hopkins claimed it would cost too much per man-hour, and therefore the money was not allotted. Therefore, this project has not even been given consideration because of the fact that the record showed there was \$75,000 allotted by P. W. A. which cannot be spent upon the project. Therefore, our Marquette Bay project is held up. There are any number of projects in the Great Lakes region that are in need of funds, but I want to call special attention to this Presque Isle Harbor project that will cost \$575,000. Just a year or two ago, because of the fact that this harbor is not fit for vessels to enter, one vessel, costing over \$400,000, was destroyed. If this money is appropriated to this project, then our ore shipments and our navigation will be improved. Unless this money is spent upon these harbors in northern Michigan, it will cripple our navigation. We will not be able to proceed.

I may say that the Secretary of War himself has approved of these projects and says they are necessary.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Hook] has expired.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may revise and extend my remarks and to include therein certain letters that I have received with regard to these projects.

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

There was no objection.

LAKE SUPERIOR & ISHPEMING RAILROAD CO.,  
Marquette, Mich., December 27, 1934.

Hon. FRANK E. HOOK,

Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: A short time ago the Marquette Daily Mining Journal contained a news dispatch from Washington that the Presque Isle Harbor-Marquette Bay improvement project is included in the Great Lakes rivers and harbors development program recommended to Congress by the War Department district engineers.

This was recommended by the Secretary of War August 10, 1932, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives under the following title:

[House of Representatives, Doc. No. 473, 72d Cong., 2d sess.]

MARQUETTE BAY, HARBOR OF REFUGE (PRESQUE ISLE HARBOR), MICH.

Letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting report from the Chief of Engineers on preliminary examination and survey of harbor of refuge, Marquette Bay (Presque Isle Harbor), Mich.

This contains recommendations from Maj. Gen. Lytle Brown, Chief of Engineers; Col. W. J. Barden, Corps of Engineers; Col. E. M. Markham; Maj. P. C. Bullard; and Colonel Deakyne; it is suggested that you secure a copy for full particulars.

This recommendation includes the extension of the breakwater and also the deepening of the harbor in accordance with the standards adopted by the War Department.

The total estimated cost of this improvement is \$547,000 for both the breakwater extension and the dredging.

The Presque Isle Harbor is an important factor in shipping of iron ore; it stood fourth of the 11 iron-ore shipping railroads by docks in the Lake Superior region in 1933 and 1934. Shipments of the past 6 years were as follows:

	Long tons
1929	3,572,545
1930	2,410,986
1931	1,212,752
1932 (this was depression year and the total shipments from Lake Superior region were only 3,568,000 tons)	192,453
1933	2,192,848
1934	1,571,214

It is doubtful if there is any harbor on the Great Lakes where there is such great necessity for these improvements as at Presque Isle Harbor. The present breakwater extends from Presque Isle southeasterly about 1,200 feet and the recommendation in the document referred to is for an additional length of 1,600 feet so that the proper safety may be given to vessels entering and leaving Presque Isle Harbor and to protect them while they are tied

to the dock during the storms from the northwest, north, and northeast, which cause the greatest risk and often necessitate vessels going to Marquette Harbor for shelter, or because the surge on the mooring lines is so heavy that the large vessels cannot be held at the dock; this improvement will overcome that serious condition.

Because of the surges and the difficulty in maneuvering the vessels, there have been many minor and near accidents and some serious accidents, the most serious being to the steamer *Sheable* in 1920, that damage amounting to \$426,000, which was due entirely to the lack of sufficient length of breakwater.

Because of the recommendation of the Secretary of War and the important necessity for this improvement we endeavored through Congressman James to have this work done during 1934, but there was no appropriation for it.

Vessels of many ownerships come to this harbor for cargoes; the Lake Carriers Association, consisting of practically all the vessel owners on the Great Lakes are fully aware of this need and have given it their strong recommendation.

Now that there is a definite recommendation for this improvement, which is in your district, it is hoped it can be done in 1935, and I am writing before the session of the new Congress to ask your efforts to have it included in the program for 1935.

Will appreciate very much if you will advise me the prospect, and also the names of the members of the Rivers and Harbors Committee, and if you suggest that they also be written or interviewed or if you prefer to negotiate with them alone.

Yours truly,

H. R. HARRIS,  
Vice President and General Manager.

INLAND STEEL CO.,  
Chicago, February 5, 1935.

Hon. FRANK E. HOOK,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: As you perhaps know, our company operates iron mines in Marquette County and moves a substantial tonnage of ore through the port of Marquette.

With the opening of navigation on the Great Lakes not far away, I have recently received a very urgent letter from the captain of one of our freighters calling my attention to a serious condition existing at the Presque Isle dock of the Lake Superior & Ishpeming Railway Co., situated near Marquette, Mich., over which our ore moves. He points out that under certain conditions of weather it is extremely dangerous for a large ship to remain in the loading position alongside that dock. A few years ago a large steamer suffered complete disaster by attempting to maneuver under these conditions, and since that time apprehension has grown with respect to this danger. It is only lately that our fleet has been operating to this dock, so that the hazard is new to us; but our operation is now a permanent one at that point, therefore we are disturbed about it.

A few days ago, upon receipt of this letter, I wrote to the officials of the railway company asking that steps be taken to protect vessels from this hazard, and they at once replied that a project was pending in Congress which if carried out would eliminate the danger.

They informed me that you are already familiar with this project, and I should therefore like to take this opportunity of urging upon you its extreme importance and asking that it receive your effective consideration.

Very truly yours,

CLARENCE B. RANDALL,  
Vice President.

CITY OF MARQUETTE,

Marquette, Mich., December 31, 1934.

Hon. FRANK E. HOOK,

Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: On December 27 Mr. H. R. Harris, vice president and general manager of the Lake Superior & Ishpeming Railway, wrote you relative to Presque Isle Harbor-Marquette Bay improvement project, which the Marquette Mining Journal reported as having been included in the Great Lakes rivers and harbors development program recommended to Congress by the War Department district engineers. The letter from Mr. Harris to you covers the tonnage data for this harbor and other important information pertinent to the project, and I will, therefore, not go into this detail. I wish to say, however, on behalf of the city of Marquette, that we are very much interested in the improvement of this harbor. It is a worthwhile and necessary project, and, as you will note, the tonnage involved is so great that the money expended by the Government would help a great deal in facilitating the business of this port and, at the same time, eliminate hazards of navigation to which the harbor is now subjected.

This matter came up for discussion about a year ago, and at that time we took the matter up with various parties, including the Department at Washington, also with Mr. Horatio J. Abbott, national committeeman for Michigan. He promised to do all he could to assist in obtaining the appropriation for the project. It would afford employment for many men, and thus assist in the reduction of unemployment. The merits of this improvement are such that it would appear reasonable to expect that it would be high on the list of approved Government projects. We would appreciate it very much if you would lend your efforts toward the completion of the details necessary to make this appropriation effective, and would like to hear from you at your convenience regarding prospects relat-

ing thereto. With kindest regards and wishing you and your family a happy and prosperous New Year, I remain,  
Yours very truly,

A. F. JACQUES, Mayor.

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,  
Marquette, Mich., March 19, 1935.

Hon. FRANK E. HOOK,  
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HOOK: This morning's Daily Mining Journal, in a news item dated Washington, March 18, states that the House Rivers and Harbors Committee have approved an extension of 1,600 feet to the breakwater at Presque Isle Harbor and the deepening of the harbor, but apparently the appropriation has not been authorized.

As you know, the Secretary of War recommended this project, in the House of Representatives Document No. 473, Seventy-second Congress, second session, at a cost of \$547,000, it having been previously recommended by the War Department engineers after they had investigated and surveyed the harbor and determined that there was much hazard to boats entering and leaving and maneuvering within the harbor and while being loaded, and that the breakwater extension was of vital necessity to protect the vessels using the harbor.

It becomes necessary during storm periods to beach the vessels in the sand on the shore or to ground them by filling their tanks with water to prevent serious damage. One steamer, due to inadequate protection, when maneuvering to leave the harbor, grounded on a rocky shoal and sustained a loss of \$426,000. Storms frequently reach such intensity that vessels moored to the dock part their lines, break their deck engines, and damage their plates, resulting in many minor damages to vessels.

During storm conditions it is extremely hazardous to enter or to leave this harbor, and when approaching it during the progress of a storm or in departing they are required to seek shelter at Marquette Harbor, which causes serious delays, and only by anticipating the approach of a storm can such maneuvering be accomplished. There is also a heavy undercurrent which is serious.

There is located in the harbor one iron-ore dock and one general-merchandise dock, both of which are used by the general shipping interests of the Great Lakes. There are 27 different boat lines that use them. The Lake Carriers' Association, representing these various vessels' interests, is vitally interested and is endeavoring to secure this much-needed protection.

During the ore-shipping season of 1933 there were 294 boats loaded at the ore dock and 236 in 1934—and this was during the depression years. There have been as high as 375 boats loaded at the dock. For 5 years prior to 1930 there was shipped from this harbor an annual average of 2,711,320 tons of ore. Document no. 473, referred to, states that from 1916 to 1931 the average shipments were two and one-half million tons per year. During this business depression this has, of course, been reduced somewhat; however, reliable estimates of the business to be transported through this harbor in the future indicate that the annual tonnage mentioned above will continue for many years to come, and there is much likelihood that it will be increased. This dock ranks fourth as to shipments of ore in the Lake Superior region, and that in itself indicates its importance.

We understand that this project has been recommended to you by others, but we are writing so that you will know that the Marquette Chamber of Commerce has given its approval, and we earnestly request that you use your influence to secure the necessary appropriation to carry out the work as planned. If there is anything that we can do to assist, we will be glad to do so.

While the protection to the vessels is of the greatest importance, to have this extension made at the present time would assist in relieving the unemployment situation.

Yours very truly,

MARQUETTE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,  
GEORGE C. QUINNELL, President.

[Telegram]

JUNE 29, 1935.

Mr. E. L. PEARCE,

Care of Chamber of Commerce, Marquette, Mich.:

Presque Isle Harbor project approved by War Department. Approved by National Emergency Council. Sent to Works Progress Administration May 21. Contacted National Emergency Council this morning; advised it was before advisory committee on allotments. Contacted Works Progress Administration; they advised me that on account of order issued by Harry Hopkins that no project should run over \$1,100 per man per year, therefore, they refused to consider it as a work-relief project. Captain Clay, of War Department, working on this now trying to bring it within ruling. Letter explaining in detail follows. Will do everything I can.

FRANK E. HOOK,  
Member of Congress.

Official business; Government charge.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, D. C., June 29, 1935.

Mr. RUSH CULVER,  
Marquette, Mich.

DEAR RUSH: I have been working on the Presque Isle Harbor project and will give you the status of same at the present time. This was included in the rivers and harbors bill, which is H. R.

6732, House Document 473, page 15, of the bill. This carries a recommendation for \$650,000.

On May 21 this year it was submitted to the P. W. A., and funds requested for the project. The project was completely approved by the War Department, and the War Department engineers recommended that it be started immediately. The National Emergency Council recommended that it be approved and sent it to the Works Progress Administration for their comments.

I had a talk with Mr. Pearce, of Marquette, over long-distance telephone this morning and wanted to write him direct, but do not have his initials. I wish you would contact him immediately with regard to this.

I have kept in constant touch with this proposition, and after receiving the call from Mr. Pearce I appeared at the National Emergency Council and was informed there that they had approved it and expected a clearance. They told me, however, that it was up to Harry Hopkins' outfit, known as the Works Progress Administration. I went down there and contacted a man by the name of Mr. Fellos and, by the way, this man Fellos is a former Michigan man. He called the War Department again and talked with a Captain Clay, who is in the Munitions Building, and who is handling this project. He informed me that because of the fact that it would take considerable material that they could not get it within the rule of \$1,100 per man per year, due to the fact that it would not take enough direct labor.

I informed Mr. Fellos that, in my opinion, this rule laid down by Harry Hopkins was one of the most foolish things that I knew of. I asked him whether or not they expected to keep men on relief permanently, and assured them that if their ideas as set forth by Harry Hopkins was put into effect they might just as well have men out raking leaves, hauling sand from one side of the road to the other, and doing nothing constructive. I informed them further that I was not in sympathy with Mr. Hopkins' ideas of handling this. It is my opinion that Harry Hopkins is the biggest detriment that this administration has. I believe he is a millstone around President Roosevelt's neck, and the sooner the President gets rid of him the sooner this country will have recovery.

With Harry Hopkins handling this thing as he is attempting to do, we will have a bunch of social workers in the picture; and you know as well as I do that if men were put on jobs where they could earn a decent living and the country brought back to recovery, that the social workers would be out of a job.

This project is a worthy project, one that has met the approval of every department, and, on account of Harry Hopkins' crazy rule, it seems to be doomed for this year.

You may rest assured, however, and you may inform Mr. Pearce and the others that are interested, that I am going to keep after this with all the vigor and force that I have until I get something definite. You may rest assured also that I am going to use whatever influence that I have to help change this rule or policy that Harry Hopkins is laying down, which is blocking practically every worthy project that we have.

I am sorry that this project has met with a set-back, and hope to be able to give you some better news soon. I know that this letter is not very encouraging.

Very truly yours,

FRANK E. HOOK, M. C.

Mr. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 35 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, an ancient prophet once said:

I will bring the blind by a way they know not.  
I will lead them in paths they have not known.  
I will make darkness light before them and crooked things straight.

It is with this spiritual as well as patriotic purpose in mind that I shall address myself to the subject of the tariff, its effects upon agriculture, industry, and labor, as revealed by history. When I shall have finished I hope that the blind followers of free trade will see a new light and that their crooked thinking will have been made straight.

No one man in the Constitutional Convention of 1787 contributed more to the immortal document, the Federal Constitution, than did James Madison, a loyal disciple of Thomas Jefferson. It will be recalled that the Federal Constitution was formulated in 1787 and ratified later by the States. The First Congress under the new Constitution was called to meet in New York, March 4, 1789, and it did actually assemble for the transaction of business in April of that year. Spread before this group of patriotic Americans in Congress assembled were the blank pages of a new Republic, destined, under the sound economic principles then and there adopted, to become a mighty nation.

How important did James Madison consider a tariff to the development of the new Republic? So important did he consider it that on the second day of the first meeting of the Congress, "the House of Representatives being in a Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union", he offered a reso-

lution that specific duties should be devised on spirituous liquors, wines, teas, sugar, pepper, cocoa, and spices, and an ad valorem duty on all other articles. Thus the first tariff was sponsored by a Democrat closer to Thomas Jefferson, the founder of that party, than any other living man.

This tariff bill was supported and passed by the followers of Thomas Jefferson. The debates show that this tariff bill was passed to safeguard American industries against foreign competition. Why do I mention these historic facts? I do so to remove from the minds of thoughtful Democrats partisan bias and prejudice against a protective tariff. I know the answer of those who would have our country put on a free-trade basis, the answer that you have dinned into the public ears for years rather than admit candidly the errors of your position. You will say as you have always said that Madison in offering the resolution had in view only the obtaining of revenue for the support of government. The best evidence of the purpose he had in mind is to be found in the preamble to the resolution itself, which reads as follows:

Whereas it is necessary for the support of government, for the discharge of the debts of the United States, and the encouragement and protection of manufactures that duties be laid on goods, wares, and merchandise imported.

But what more does the record reveal? Mr. Madison stated that he was—

Looking to the preservation of internal industries upon which the Government and the people could rely for strength and well-being.

Furthermore, when questioned as to the constitutionality of the tariff act, he asserted that the right to regulate commerce with foreign nations delegated by the several States "embraces the object of encouraging by duties the products of the country."

What about the position of Thomas Jefferson on the tariff? In his message in 1802 he said:

To cultivate peace, maintain commerce and navigation, to foster our fisheries, and protect manufacturers adapted to our circumstances are the landmarks by which to guide ourselves in all our relations.

Thomas Jefferson wrote a letter to J. B. Say, a French economist, in which he expressed his views on the tariff in no uncertain language. I quote:

The prohibiting duties we lay on all articles of foreign manufacture which prudence requires us to establish at home, with the patriotic determination of every good citizen to use no foreign article which can be made by ourselves, without regard to difference in cost, secure us against a relapse into foreign dependency.

And did not Jefferson, when he believed a national exigency required it, lay an embargo against goods of British manufacture?

After the War of 1812 had been won President Madison sent a special message to Congress. At that time our country was prosperous because the war had shut out imports and our industries had been permitted to enjoy the home market unhampered by the products of cheap foreign labor. President Madison, in his special message to Congress, cautioned against destroying this prosperity. He asked his Secretary of the Treasury, A. J. Dallas, to make an estimate of what amount of reduction of tariff rates would be safe, but made it plain that the protective feature should be preserved. Unfortunately the Congress lowered the duties to a point that failed to protect.

What is the judgment of history on the wisdom or lack of it in reducing the tariff rates in 1816?

Woodrow Wilson, in his *History of the American Republic*, referring to this tariff act, said:

It was manifestly injurious to every young industry that a flood of English imports should continue to pour into the country at the open ports. The remedy was a protective tariff.

Did not James Monroe say in his message of December 2, 1817:

Our manufactures will require the continual attention of Congress. \* \* \* Their preservation, which depends on due encouragement, is connected with the high interest of the Nation.

Permit me to marshal evidence from Democratic sources in condemnation of the low-tariff policy adopted in 1816 lest I be charged with partisanship. Senator Thomas H. Benton, of Missouri, graphically described the effect of that low-tariff act in these words:

No price for property, no sales except those of the sheriff and the marshal; no employment for industry; no demand for labor; no sales for the products of the farmer. Distress was the universal cry of the people.

But let us call another witness. Hear what Henry Clay had to say of the years following the low Tariff Act of 1816. I quote:

If one desires to find the 7 years of greatest adversity in this country since the adoption of the Constitution, let him examine the 7 years before 1824.

The testimony of the witnesses I have produced to show the folly of the low-tariff experiment of 1816 ought to have probative force, even with present-day Democrats. What happened following this tragic experience with a low-tariff act? This period of acute national distress was followed in 1824 by the restoration of protection. Recovery was so prompt, so effective, so general that Andrew Jackson testified to the benefits derived from the higher duties of the act of 1824 in these words:

Our country presents on every side marks of prosperity unequalled perhaps in any other portion of the world.

It was at this point that great leaders shifted their position upon the tariff. Daniel Webster, impelled by the logic of events, shifted from his free-trade position to that of a stanch protectionist, a position from which he never afterward departed. John C. Calhoun shifted from his stand as a protectionist to that of a free-trader. From that time on the Democratic Party repudiated the sound economic law of national self-preservation. After 1824 it became the sponsor of international doctrine.

This change in Democratic economic philosophy came soon after the invention of the cotton gin. Then it was that the leadership of Mr. Calhoun repudiated the tariff ideas of its founders. No man in public life up to that time had more ably presented the arguments for protection than had John C. Calhoun. Even in 1818, 6 years before he repudiated the tariff views of Madison, Jefferson, and Monroe, while visiting a factory on the River Charles in Massachusetts, where the first power loom in America had been installed, Mr. Calhoun said that it was he and William Lowndes, of South Carolina, who were responsible for establishing this industry because of the encouragement given to the enterprise by their fight for a protective tariff.

Mr. Calhoun reversed himself on the tariff in 1824 and later opposed the collection of custom duties at the ports of South Carolina. The Democratic Party "took a walk", deserted protection, and alined itself with the foreign importing interests. Why did Mr. Calhoun change his position? It was because his constituents in South Carolina were agriculturists, cotton was their principal crop and their chief pursuit. It was produced by slave labor; therefore they felt that it required no protection. They believed it to be to their advantage to sell their cotton abroad and to purchase such goods as they required in the foreign market. Mr. Calhoun, no doubt, changed his position on the tariff to coincide with the views of his constituents, but in doing so he lacked the penetrating vision to foresee the necessity of our home market for agriculture, including cotton.

One leader of that time to whom modern Democrats now give lip service, but whose doctrines they have repudiated in practice, was Andrew Jackson. He was neither deceived nor misled by the economic sophistry of that time. When the high tariff bill was before the Congress in 1824 he voted for it, and when challenged for doing so, he answered his critics with his usual candor and logic, even those who threatened him with political reprisal if he supported the higher tariff rates. Dr. L. H. Coleman, of Warrenton, N. C., a political supporter, threatened to relax his partisan zeal if Old Hickory did not conform to his views. Jackson wrote to him:

It is time we should become a little more Americanized, and instead of feeding the paupers and laborers of Europe, feed our own,

or else in a short time, by continuing our present policy, we shall all be paupers ourselves.

On June 18, 1824, Jackson wrote to Brigadier General Coffee as follows:

What is our situation? Have we a market for any surplus agricultural products but sugar and cotton, and cotton very precarious; and cannot expect to continue except the home market which has and will be opened for it by the manufacturing of the raw material in America; what is the consequence. If a home market is not created, there being no foreign market, I answer the agricultural interests must continue to languish, and the farmer must withdraw himself from the consumption of the dutiable article, not being able from the product of his labor to pay for it. \* \* \* It is the course of the antitariff men that must inevitably lead to direct taxation, by depressing agriculture from the want of a foreign or home market for their surplus products, by which they become unable to procure and consume the dutiable articles.

It must not be overlooked that South Carolina threatened to secede rather than pay the duties imposed under the 1824 Tariff Act. This stubborn resistance to the collection of customs under the tariff law by the followers of Mr. Calhoun was met by President Jackson with vigor and firmness.

This head-on collision of economic principles finally resulted in the compromise bill sponsored by Henry Clay, which became a law March 2, 1833. This act reduced the tariff duties contained in the 1824 Tariff Act, with the result that foreign imports poured into this country until business and industry were prostrate.

To check this devastating foreign competition a tariff bill increasing import duties was passed in 1842. Prior to the enactment of this tariff act sheep sold under the hammer in Missouri at 13½ cents a head and cattle brought only a dollar and a half. Let us call a witness on the effect of the low tariff bill of 1833 and the high tariff bill of 1842. John M. Berrin, United States Senator from the State of Georgia, declared:

The credit of the Government was prostrate and has been redeemed. The Treasury was empty; it is now replenished. The commerce and navigation of the country have increased. Its agricultural condition has improved.

Prosperity continued from 1842 to 1846. The best proof of the fact is to be found in the message of President Polk to the Congress. I quote:

Abundance has crowned the toil of the husbandman, and labor in all its branches is receiving an ample reward. \* \* \* The progress of our country in her career of greatness, not only in the vast extent of our territorial limits and rapid increase of our population, but in resources and wealth, and in the happy conditions of our people, is without an example in the history of nations.

The Democratic Party was in control of the Congress in 1846. The Walker bill, lowering tariff rates was enacted that year. Fortunately for the United States, four events intervened, which for a time delayed the disaster which inevitably follows a drastic reduction in the tariff rates. These four events, viz, the Mexican War, the Irish famine, the discovery of gold in California, and the Crimean War. The Crimean conflict involved Great Britain, France, Germany, and Turkey, stimulating our sales abroad and acting as an embargo to the importation of foreign goods. When hostilities ceased, however, releasing foreign shipping, our ports were deluged with cheap foreign-made goods.

Instead of recognizing the real cause of our industrial and agricultural paralysis, the Congress in 1857 further reduced tariff duties. I shall not describe what followed, but instead I shall call a Democratic witness to do so. President Buchanan in his message to the Congress in 1858 said:

With all the elements of national wealth in abundance our manufactures were suspended, our useful public enterprises were arrested, and thousands of laborers were deprived of employment and reduced to want. Universal distress prevailed among the commercial, manufacturing, and mechanical classes.

Two years later, December 4, 1860, referring to the widespread suffering and disaster then existing, President Buchanan said:

Indeed, all hope seems to have deserted the minds of men.

What I have been offering in the way of testimony is from Democrats. You cannot deny the facts without impeach-

ing the intelligence and judgment of the statesmen you profess to follow.

Every low tariff experiment, except when a foreign war has intervened to act as an embargo against foreign importations, has brought the same result, viz, unemployment, breadlines, suffering, bankruptcy, and industrial and commercial disaster.

The revival of industry and agriculture following the 14 years of low tariff and hard times prior to the Civil War came with the enactment of the Morrill Protective Tariff Act. Thereafter industrial prosperity continued with only slight interruption until the enactment of the Wilson-Gorman Tariff Act.

What was the condition of the country in December 1892? I respectfully call my first Republican witness to show the condition of the Nation at that time. President Harrison said:

There never has been a time in our history when work was so abundant or wages were so high, whether measured by the currency in which they are paid or by their power to supply the necessities and comforts of life.

What event intervened to destroy this happy state of affairs? The Democratic Party was entrusted with power on March 4, 1893, and the announcement was immediately made that a low-tariff measure, with all raw products on the free list, would be enacted. The announced intention to lower the tariff destroyed public confidence. Now I call a Democratic witness.

President Grover Cleveland, to contrast conditions under Benjamin Harrison's administration with conditions as they existed on August 8, 1893, under the Democratic administration, stated:

With plentious crops, with abundant promise of remunerative production and manufacture, with unusual invitation to safe investment, and with satisfactory assurance to business enterprise, suddenly financial distress and fear have sprung up on every side. \* \* \* Values supposed to be fixed are fast becoming conjectural, and loss and failure have invaded every branch of business.

Past experience meant nothing to the Democratic leaders. The Wilson-Gorman bill, putting all raw materials of the South on the free list, was enacted in 1894. Some of your statesmen, faithful followers of Jefferson, Madison, and Jackson, condemned the enactment of the Wilson-Gorman Low Tariff Act as rank economic and political heresy, but to no avail. The bill was passed. The disaster resulting from this legislation was visited upon the South as well as the North.

Permit me to again call a Democrat as a witness to show what was done to the South when you deserted the economic doctrine of Andrew Jackson and practically placed sugar on the free list. I offer the testimony of the former Governor of Louisiana, who described the effect of the low tariff on the domestic-sugar producers:

There were 62 sugar mills between New Orleans and the Gulf before the action was taken. The number was reduced to one, and more than a hundred million dollars was wiped out at a single stroke of the pen. It is a human impossibility for the sugar farmer, even with the most modern equipment to come in competition with Cuba and its cheap labor. Our living standards are so far above theirs that it cannot be done.

Mr. Chairman, experience should have taught the public long before this that when low duties have destroyed the domestic production of a necessity of life, then the foreigner who has been given a monopoly and made master of the situation fixes the price which our consumers must pay or go without. What did our consumers pay for sugar in 1920? Our consumers were obliged to pay as high as 35 cents a pound for this necessity because forced to relinquish home production by a low tariff. Are other countries following the short-sighted policy of the United States in placing themselves at the mercy of a foreign country for one of the prime necessities of life? The answer is that the United States levies a lower duty on sugar imports from Cuba, where we get our principal supply, than any of the European countries. I quote the duty on sugar imposed by each of the following countries:

*Sugar tariffs of certain foreign countries (96 degrees polarization)*

[Approximate duty and internal tax (U. S. cents per pound)]

## Country:

Argentina	14.83
Belgium	2.50
Brazil	17.20
Czechoslovakia	10.17
France	8.20
Germany	9.64
Greece	4.50
Italy	18.70
Mexico	2.33
Spain	11.70
United Kingdom	1.70

<sup>1</sup> Includes surtax and internal tax.<sup>2</sup> Includes consumption and turn-over tax.<sup>3</sup> Includes additional taxes; duty alone is 5.1 cents per pound.<sup>4</sup> Includes internal tax.<sup>5</sup> Includes surtax.<sup>6</sup> Includes import surtax; 18 percent of c. i. f. value imposed in addition.<sup>7</sup> Imports from British Dominions, 0.9 cent per pound; from British colonies, 0.3 cent per pound.

Data furnished by Division of Foreign Tariffs, U. S. Department of Commerce.

But what has the administration been doing to build up this nonsurplus crop? Instead of attempting to build up our domestic production, it has tried to limit expansion of acreage under a system of quotas, and it has entered into a trade agreement with Cuba, which further stifles this business by reducing the tariff on imported sugar.

It will be recalled that under the Hawley-Smoot Tariff Act of 1930 the duty on 96-degree sugar was fixed at 2.5 cents per pound. By reason of 20-percent differential in favor of Cuban products, under the treaty of 1903, the rate on Cuban sugar was 2 cents per pound.

On May 9, 1934, the President exercised his powers under the flexible-tariff provision by reducing the duty on sugar to 1.875 cents per pound, thus bringing the Cuban rate down to 1.5 cents per pound.

Under the Cuban trade agreement, which became effective September 3, 1934, the President granted Cuba a further reduction of 40 percent, reducing the rate on Cuban sugar to 0.9 cents per pound.

Since practically all the sugar which we import from foreign countries comes from Cuba, we may say for all practical purposes that the present rate of duty on sugar is 0.9 cents per pound. So much for sugar. The producers of cane and beet sugar will have an opportunity to reflect on this subject as the months go by, and so will our consumers when placed at the mercy of foreign producers of sugar.

In 1913 a Democratic administration lowered the duties. The World War intervened, and until hostilities ceased the war acted as a partial embargo, but immediately the war closed there was no tariff barrier to check imports. I know that the suffering caused to northern industries by that legislation may not disturb those whose only answer is that a tariff is "a robber," but to the cattlemen and sheep producers who were ruined, the facts revealed a different picture. The stockmen of the Southwest have not forgotten what Argentine shipments of frozen beef did to them. Cattle raisers of Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, and Wyoming know what they suffered from the importations in 1920. They saw their home market glutted and paralyzed and their credit destroyed.

I doubt if the woolgrowers have forgotten the nearly half billion pounds of wool that was imported into their home market in the year ending June 30, 1920. They recall quite vividly and painfully that their wool remained in warehouses while foreign wool sold here far below the cost of domestic production. They know that when wool went on the free list Australia and New Zealand captured the American wool market. The history of all this is a matter of record in the bankruptcy courts of the wool-producing States.

It will be recalled that conditions throughout the Nation were desperate. Suffering was acute and widespread. Millions of men were out of work, and to feed them soup kitchens were opened in every city. Such were the conditions in the fall of 1918. When the election was held in November of that year the voters repudiated the party that had promised to "keep us out of war" and put a Republican Congress in power.

One of the most important pieces of legislation to be passed by the Republican Congress was an emergency tariff bill to relieve distress among the farmers, especially the cattlemen and sheep raisers. It would have placed emergency duties on the most important agricultural products, which the Democratic Tariff Act of 1913 had placed on the free list. President Wilson vetoed the bill on March 3, 1921, the day before he went out of office.

The previous November, the people had elected both a Republican President and a Republican Congress. The first thing Mr. Harding did when he assumed office was to call a special session of Congress to consider the farm problem. The emergency tariff bill was immediately reintroduced and passed, and was signed by President Harding on May 27, 1921. It was intended to operate until a permanent general tariff law could be written. What was the result? The price of wool advanced from 20 to 50 cents a pound, and soon a high level of prosperity was attained. Moreover, 5,000,000 idle men were put to work—not on relief projects but in industry—thus creating a market for our farmers.

I have not forgotten, nor have the Members of Congress, that in May 1923, following the passage of the Fordney-McCumber Act in 1922, a commission of southern Governors and commissioners of agriculture journeyed to Washington to tell a Republican President that they were doing well under the tariff law and urged that the schedules be not disturbed.

There is not a Democrat on this floor who does not know that every southern city made greater progress, underwent greater development, enjoyed greater prosperity under the Fordney-McCumber tariff than it had during any previous decade. It is known to every Member of the Congress that no industrial city—north, south, east, or west—can prosper under a low tariff. Yet in spite of the facts many Members in this House laud and applaud the bartering away of our home market under the so-called trade agreements.

I challenge any free-trade Democrat to point to a single nation that has built up its industrial strength under a system of free trade. The industrial ascendancy of every nation can be traced to a policy of protection. Once industrial stability has been established by a nation under a protective system, a shift by that nation to a free-trade policy has been at the cost of a lower standard of living for its people.

British statesmen built up her industries under a system of protection. Prior to the system of protection established under Edward III wool was the chief product of England; this she exported to Flanders, where it was manufactured into beautiful fabrics. Edward III decided to prohibit the exportation of wool and to put a duty on the importations from Flanders. It was this policy of protection that developed the great industrial centers of Sheffield, Nottingham, and Manchester. After the British industries had been developed a movement was started to abandon the policy of protection, adopt free trade, and capture the markets of the world. Why this change of policy? The statesmen, some of them, reasoned that as England led the world with her great industries, that no country could compete with her in the low cost of production. Fortunately for the United States, the challenge was met by our statesmen with three protective-tariff acts, the Morrill bill, the McKinley bill, and the Dingley bill. It was these three acts that saved us from industrial servitude.

Did the change of policy benefit England? It did not. Many times since, her statesmen have had cause to reflect upon the prophecy of her great prime minister, Benjamin Disraeli, in his effort to deter his nation from this shift in policy. He warned his countrymen in these words:

It may be in vain now, in the midnight of their intoxication, to tell them there will be an awakening of bitterness. It may be idle now, in the springtide of their economic frenzy, to warn them that there will be an ebb of trouble. But the dark and inevitable hour will arrive; then—when their spirit is softened by misfortune—they will recur to those principles which made England great.

The accuracy of Benjamin Disraeli's prophecy was recognized 30 years ago by Joseph Chamberlain in these words:

What has most impressed me is that every great prediction that was made by the Manchester school has failed of realization; that other nations have progressed under a different system more rapidly than we have; that our comparative decline has become more and more evident.

Now, when other nations are beginning to recognize the folly of permitting their markets to be taken from them, we proceed to barter away the jobs of millions of our workmen, destroy the home market for our farmers, and put our farmers and our workingmen in competition with the cheap labor of other countries. We are deliberately surrendering the greatest asset upon which our farmers and laborers must rely for their well-being, namely, the home market, the best cash market in the world, the market that when protected absorbs more than 90 percent of all that the Nation produces; a market that under the fostering care of adequate protection would absorb practically our entire surplus.

Because of our lack of vision, must history some day record that our Government put our people in competition with the most poorly fed, clothed, and housed laborers of the world? Must it eventually be said of us, as it has been said of other nations that have followed such a system:

Thousands of the manufacturing poor are, even when employed, reduced to such a state of poverty in the midst of abounding opulence that they live not in houses but in underground cellars, lighted only by the entrance. Daylight comes to them an hour later than to other people, and leaves them an hour earlier. No chair, no bed, is found in many of these subterranean caverns. The wretched inmates huddle together without distinction of age or sex, sometimes on the broken straw of rapeseed, sometimes even on dry sand. \* \* \*

What is the use of talking as though our tariff had been responsible for establishing barriers to international trade? Every person who is conversant with the facts knows that in 1921, when the United States was collecting customs at the customhouses amounting to \$3.29 per capita, England was collecting revenue at her customhouses amounting to \$14.75 per capita. Is there anybody so naive as to believe that England is not using her high tariff to the utmost to protect her industries, as well as to use it to drive bargains with other countries to the advantage of her industries? If there are such persons, let me quote from the London Times of March 9, 1935:

The importance of the tariff weapon in negotiating trade agreements was emphasized by Mr. Runciman, president of the Board of Trade, at a National Government meeting at Norwich last night. "I have made trade agreements," he said "with 15 different countries, and I say emphatically that if I had not been armed with the weapon of a tariff it would have been absolutely impossible for me to have made even one agreement."

We are trying to enter into trade agreements when it is demonstrated by official figures that under our present tariff rates exports have increased only 7 percent and our imports have increased 24 percent.

It is evident from these figures that the Hawley-Smoot Tariff Act, which you so vigorously condemned in 1930, and which you have not dared to repeal, has not been sufficiently high to prevent the ever-increasing volume of imports from entering the United States. Yet, instead of taking steps to protect agriculture, labor, and industry, this administration is now whittling down what little protection we have by entering into star-chamber trade agreements with foreign nations.

Why was the Hawley-Smoot tariff bill enacted into law? It was passed primarily to relieve the American farmer from the crushing effect of importations of farm products which, in spite of the tariff rates in the Fordney-McCumber Act, were pouring into our domestic market. Let us examine the figures as to imports, especially agricultural products, that were flooding our market during and covering the year from July 1926 to June 1927. The figures of the United States Department of Commerce show that total imports were valued at \$4,252,000,000; that \$3,300,000,000 of these were agricultural products; and that \$2,545,000,000 of these, eliminating coffee, tea, cocoa, and rubber, were products which we could grow on our farms, either the same or a practical substitute therefor.

If we take only a part of these agricultural imports—not the whole, but after eliminating lumber and paper, pulp—in order to be ultraconservative it leaves \$900,000,000 of imports. This amount displaced during the year from July 1926 to June 1927 a total of 82,203,550 acres of farm land. Does any thoughtful person contend that this dis-

placement did not cause an accumulation of surplus farm crops which depressed our domestic prices?

Why not face the facts and be honest with the American farmer about the tariff? Candor demands that we consider figures showing the displacement of farm lands during the year 1926 to 1927. I submit a table which discloses estimated acreage displaced by each class of imports:

*Estimate of farm acreage thrown out of production by agricultural imports*

Imports		Quantity	Value	Plow land acreage displaced
Cattle	head	267,000	\$7,000,000	1,602,000
Hogs	pounds	40,465,000	5,000,000	140,000
Meat	do	92,054,000	14,000,000	1,600,000
Poultry	do	5,510,000	2,000,000	18,000
Milk and cream	gallons	11,380,000	9,000,000	570,000
Butter	pounds	10,710,000	4,000,000	236,000
Cheese	do	90,000,000	25,000,000	900,000
Eggs	do	26,141,000	7,000,000	83,600
Casein and lacterine	do	26,320,000	3,000,000	877,000
Rice	do	54,000,000	3,000,000	30,000
Wheat	bushels	13,000,000	18,000,000	900,000
Bran and wheat byproducts	tons	184,000	5,000,000	483,000
Potatoes	pounds	381,000,000	7,000,000	56,000
Tomatoes	do	124,500,000	4,000,000	16,850
Tomatoes, canned	do	80,200,000	4,000,000	11,400
Hides	do	369,000,000	95,000,000	17,000,000
Leather, raw and manufactured			51,000,000	2,000,000
Furs			138,000,000	5,000,000
Horses for breeding	head	3,000	2,100,000	30,000
Beans and chickpeas	pounds	125,000,000	5,000,000	200,000
Onions	do	131,000,000	3,000,000	8,300
Other vegetables	bunches	57,000,000	32,000,000	1,600,000
Bananas	do	5,212,000	5,000,000	44,000
Olives	gallons			
Olive oil:				
Edible	pounds	88,000,000	18,000,000	18,000
Inedible	do	46,000,000	4,000,000	340,000
Dates	do	43,400,000	3,000,000	5,700
Pineapples			2,000,000	2,800
Birds and other animals			2,500,000	22,500
Figs	pounds	39,500,000	3,000,000	5,700
Almonds	do	16,300,000	6,000,000	51,400
Nuts, Brazil and cream	do	42,867,000	3,000,000	100,000
Filberts	do	14,500,000	3,000,000	45,000
Walnuts	do	46,700,000	10,000,000	150,000
Peanuts	pounds	51,200,000	2,000,000	70,000
Sugar	tons	4,270,000	255,000,000	16,180,000
Molasses	gallons	260,000,000	10,000,000	3,000,000
Castor beans	pounds	119,400,000	4,000,000	200,000
Clover seeds	do	25,345,000	4,000,000	320,000
Tobacco	do	96,000,000	86,000,000	122,000
Cotton, raw	do	191,000,000	37,000,000	1,020,000
Cotton, semimanufactured			6,000,000	60,000
Cotton, manufactured			59,000,000	250,000
Flax and hemp, raw	tons	6,000	2,000,000	120,000
Flax and hemp, manufactured			49,000,000	600,000
Wool:				
Raw	pounds	271,000,000	83,000,000	20,000,000
Semimanufactured			12,000,000	1,000,000
Manufactured			62,000,000	1,000,000
Silk	pounds	85,000,000	421,000,000	2,500,000
Silk, manufactured			42,000,000	10,000
Artificial silk			16,000,000	20,000
Jute, raw and manufactured			92,000,000	140,000
Manila	tons	61,000	15,000,000	203,000
Sisal	do	116,000	19,000,000	258,000
Vegetable oils			52,000,000	286,000
Copra			22,000,000	200,000
Flaxseed	bushels	24,200,000	43,000,000	3,615,000
			898,600,000	82,203,550

<sup>1</sup> Native fruits displaced.

<sup>2</sup> Converted at equal pounds, cotton.

This was the situation that caused Democrats and Republicans alike to demand the protection carried in the Hawley-Smoot bill.

It is an indisputable fact that 93.73 percent of all increases, measured in value, made by the Hawley-Smoot Tariff Act, were upon products of agricultural origin.

If it had not been for the tariff dike, our farmers would have been ruined by a flood of foreign agricultural imports. Even with the agricultural rates carried in the Hawley-Smoot bill, which for political purposes Democrats in the last campaign condemned as too high, foreign imports scaled the tariff wall, and they now continue to pour into our market to the injury of our farmers.

This protection against foreign imports would have been highly effective, had there not followed soon afterward a break-down in the currency abroad which made it possible, through lower costs of production, for foreign interests to pay the duties and enter our market. It will be recalled that a bill was introduced by my colleague from New York, Mr. CROWTHER, to equalize this currency situation by adjusting

our rates and again making the tariff effective; and, although the bill was brought upon the floor of the House by petition to discharge the Ways and Means Committee, the legislation was voted down by the Democratic Congress.

This administration, instead of raising the dike to avert further devastation and displacement of our productive acres, has been and is now tearing holes in the tariff walls and letting foreign imports flow into the domestic market.

The trade agreement with Canada, Cuba, the Netherlands, and others shows a brutal indifference to the welfare of the farmers. I know what disaster the Canadian trade agreement will ultimately visit upon the farmers of New York State, especially to the dairy interests.

It does not require the tables I have inserted to show to the blind followers of free trade the devastating effect of a low tariff. All that is necessary to do in order to convince candid men of the wisdom of a protective tariff is to invite them to examine the progress this Nation has made under a century of high-tariff laws; study the conditions of labor during those years and then draw a comparison between that progress and those conditions and what you find relative to the 46 years of a tariff for revenue only, when our industries, our home markets were not protected. One is the story of prosperity, abundance, and happiness; the other reveals business stagnation and decay and bankruptcy.

There can be no sustained prosperity in this Nation, neither can our American standard of living be maintained, by following a policy that forces our agriculture and our labor to compete with the cheapest labor in the world, including foreign child labor and practically slave labor of the most backward nations. [Applause.]

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

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein the table to which I referred.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PARKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. MORAN].

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, the letter written by me today to the Comptroller General of the United States is self-explanatory and is a reply to his letter dated February 8 requesting detailed information which he has promised will be promptly examined into.

It should be pointed out that all of the foreign ocean-mail contracts referred to were negotiated by the previous and not by the present national administration; all of them were in existence before March 4, 1933.

By his Executive order dated July 11, 1934, President Roosevelt splendidly took the initiative, authorizing and requiring the Post Office Department investigation which disclosed this situation. Acting under that Executive order, Postmaster General Farley has fearlessly and efficiently investigated and has presented the facts to the public, performing a distinct public service. In this connection much credit is due to Senator Hugo L. BLACK and his associates on the so-called Black committee for its development of facts concerning these contracts.

In furnishing the Comptroller General with specific information, which I hope will enable him to stop payment on these subterfuge subsidies and lead to the establishment of the straight, honest aids proposed by President Roosevelt, and which I hope will lead to the inauguration of new merchant-marine legislation which will end present abuses and build a real American merchant marine on the principles advocated by the President, I want to make it clear that my action is not intended to reflect any criticism of the present administration of these contracts by Postmaster General Farley and his Department. On the contrary, in addition to the splendid service performed by the Postmaster General and the Post Office Department in developing the facts concerning the award of these contracts, there is the further fact that the Post Office Department's current investigation of the speed of vessels under these contracts, an

investigation undertaken under the direction of the Postmaster General, has already saved the taxpayers many thousands of dollars under these contracts, and I believe the saving will run into millions before the investigation is concluded.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, D. C., February 10, 1936.

Hon. J. R. McCARL,  
Comptroller General of the United States,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. McCARL: I hereby respectfully submit for your consideration and determination the allegation that certain foreign ocean-mail contracts, herein specified, are voidable ab initio, and further payments from the United States in connection therewith should be stopped, because (1) the Merchant Marine Act of 1928 requires competitive bidding for such contracts; and (2) that these specified contracts were not in fact awarded on basis of competitive bidding as required by said law.

#### I. MERCHANT MARINE ACT OF 1928 REQUIRES COMPETITIVE BIDDING

That the Merchant Marine Act of 1928 requires competitive bidding is evidenced by the following quotation from the law:

"Before making any contract for carrying ocean mails under this title the Postmaster General shall give public notice by advertisement once a week for 3 weeks in such daily newspapers as he shall select in each of the cities of Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, New Orleans, Charleston, Norfolk, Savannah, Jacksonville, Galveston, Houston, and Mobile, calling for bids for carrying such ocean mails; or when the proposed service is to be on the Pacific Ocean then in Los Angeles, San Francisco, Portland, Tacoma, and Seattle. Such notice shall describe the proposed route, the time when such contract will be made, the number of times a year, the schedule required, the time when the service shall commence, the character of the vessels required, and all other information deemed by the Postmaster General to be necessary to inform prospective bidders as to the character of the service to be required" (May 22, 1928, c. 675, sec. 406, 45 Stat. 694).

And "each contract for the carrying of ocean mails under this title shall be awarded to the lowest bidder who, in the judgment of the Postmaster General, possesses such qualifications as to insure proper performance of the mail service under the contract" (May 22, 1928, c. 675, sec. 407, 45 Stat. 694).

#### II. CERTAIN SPECIFIED CONTRACTS WERE NOT IN FACT AWARDED ON BASIS OF COMMITTEE BIDS AS REQUIRED BY LAW

Pursuant to Executive order of July 11, 1934, hearings were conducted by the Post Office Department on 43 foreign ocean-mail contracts and made the subject of a report of the Postmaster General to the President, dated January 11, 1935, which has been officially published. From page 5 of that report the following is quoted:

"It may be said that in spite of the fact that authority had been taken away from Government officials to negotiate mail contracts by the act of 1928, and imposed upon them the duty to award the contracts by competitive bidding, nevertheless they continued to make private agreements and negotiate private contracts. Their advertisement was a mere sham and matter of form. The practice of having no actual competitive bidding was admitted by former Postmaster General Brown, who testified at the hearing before the House Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries on H. R. 8715, January 22, 1930, as shown on page 44 of the report as follows:

"I think that some of the specifications were prepared so that it was practically impossible for more than one line to bid."

On page 54 he said:

"I am not criticizing the practice before, because it was for the purpose, frankly, of giving a contract to the operator of the line then in existence, and so the time for the beginning of the service was fixed so close to the date of the advertisement that only one person, the fellow who was already on the line, could get together a fleet to go into operation."

The following specific cases are submitted:

##### FOREIGN OCEAN-MAIL ROUTE 4

"The contract for foreign ocean-mail route no. 4 may be canceled, for there could be, and there was, no competitive bidding on the route as required by law." (Postmaster General's report to President, p. 31.)

##### FOREIGN OCEAN-MAIL ROUTE 22

"The contract on foreign ocean-mail route no. 22 may be canceled for failure to substitute the new vessel required to be furnished in 1932. The full performance of this contract is not required in the public interest." (Postmaster General's report to President, p. 31.)

##### FOREIGN OCEAN-MAIL ROUTE 5

"This contract may be canceled as having been let in violation of the law requiring competitive bidding and upon the further ground that it was contrary to the public interest in that the Export Steamship Corporation was bound contractually to perform adequate service over the route for not less than 5 years of the contract term." (Postmaster General's report to President, p. 54.)

##### FOREIGN OCEAN-MAIL ROUTE 6

"This contract may be canceled without any offer of compensation for the following reasons: (a) It was not awarded as a result of competitive bidding as required by law \* \* \*." (Postmaster General's report to President, p. 66.)

## FOREIGN OCEAN-MAIL ROUTES 8, 37, AND 38

"The contracts for foreign ocean-mail routes nos. 8, 37, and 38 may be canceled because they were awarded in violation of the law requiring that such contracts be let upon competitive bids." (Postmaster General's report to President, p. 90.)

## FOREIGN OCEAN-MAIL ROUTES 15 AND 22

"The contracts on routes 15 and 52 may be canceled. They were awarded in violation of the requirement that contracts under the Merchant Marine Act of 1928 be let upon competitive bidding." (Postmaster General's report to President, p. 108.)

## FOREIGN OCEAN-MAIL ROUTE 16

"This contract may be canceled on the ground that there could be and was no competitive bidding on the route." (Postmaster General's report to President, p. 117.)

## FOREIGN OCEAN-MAIL ROUTES 17 AND 47

"These contracts may be canceled for the reason that they were awarded after being negotiated and without opportunity for competitive bidding, and the contract covering route no. 17 may be canceled by the terms thereof for failure to provide a replacement required." (Postmaster General's report to President, p. 132.)

## FOREIGN OCEAN-MAIL ROUTE 18

"This contract may be canceled, having been awarded in violation of the law requiring competitive bidding, and the contractor having failed to put into operation on the route an additional vessel \* \* \* immediately after completion of the third year of the contract, as required by the contract." (Postmaster General's report to President, pp. 142-143.)

## FOREIGN OCEAN-MAIL ROUTE 19

"This contract may be immediately canceled on the ground that it was illegally awarded." (Postmaster General's report to President, p. 154.)

## FOREIGN OCEAN-MAIL ROUTES 20 AND 21

"These contracts may be canceled without any offer of compensation for the following reasons: (1) The contracts were negotiated and competitive bidding was precluded \* \* \*." (Postmaster General's report to President, p. 170.)

## FOREIGN OCEAN-MAIL ROUTE 23

"The advertisement was designed by the Post Office Department and the Shipping Board in such manner as to prevent competitive bidding \* \* \*." (Postmaster General's report to President, p. 54.)

## FOREIGN OCEAN-MAIL ROUTE 45

"This route is of no value as a mail route. Its establishment was not necessary 'to afford an adequate postal service between' the ports, within the meaning of section 404 of title IV of the Merchant Marine Act of 1928, and it was made without authority of law. The route was advertised in such manner as to prevent competitive bidding \* \* \*." (Postmaster General's report to President, p. 193.)

## FOREIGN OCEAN-MAIL ROUTE 57

"This contract may be canceled on the grounds herein set forth, as unlawfully negotiated"; and "the advertisement was purposely drawn so as to effectively prevent competitive bidding." (Postmaster General's report to President, p. 205.)

## FOREIGN OCEAN-MAIL ROUTE 24

"It is concluded that this contract may be canceled because it was awarded in violation of the law, which requires competitive bidding, and the advertisements of the route were so framed and worded and limited bids in such a manner as to preclude competitive bidding and did accomplish this result." (Postmaster General's report to President, p. 214.)

## FOREIGN OCEAN-MAIL ROUTES 25, 26, AND 27

"These three contracts may be canceled on the ground that they were negotiated without opportunity for competitive bidding." (Postmaster General's report to President, p. 228.)

## FOREIGN OCEAN-MAIL ROUTES 28 AND 29

"There was no competitive bidding as required by law." (Postmaster General's report to President, p. 231.)

"It is concluded that this contract may be canceled because it was awarded in violation of the law, which requires competitive bidding." (Postmaster General's report to President, p. 234.)

## FOREIGN AND OCEAN-MAIL ROUTES 30, 31, 48, AND 49

"It is concluded that these contracts may be canceled for the following reasons: (1) Because they were not awarded as the result of competitive bidding as provided by law." (Postmaster General's report to President, p. 247.)

## FOREIGN OCEAN-MAIL ROUTE 32

"The contract may be canceled because it was not awarded as a result of competitive bidding." (Postmaster General's report to President, p. 253.)

## FOREIGN OCEAN-MAIL ROUTES 43 AND 44

"The contracts may be canceled on the ground that they were entered into without competitive bidding." (Postmaster General's report to President, p. 277.)

## FOREIGN OCEAN-MAIL ROUTE 33

"It is concluded that this contract may be canceled for the reason that it is a contract awarded as a result of negotiations \* \* \* and was not awarded as a result of competitive bidding as required by law." (Postmaster General's report to President, p. 292.)

## FOREIGN OCEAN-MAIL ROUTE 34

"It is concluded that this contract may be canceled because: (a) It was awarded in violation of the law which requires competitive bidding." (Postmaster General's report to President, p. 298.)

## FOREIGN OCEAN-MAIL ROUTE 36

"This contract may be canceled for the reason that it was awarded after negotiation and not as the result of competitive bidding, and for the reason that the contractor has failed to provide the substitute vessel, as required by the contract." (Postmaster General's report to the President, p. 318.)

## FOREIGN OCEAN-MAIL ROUTES 39, 40, AND 41

"It is believed that the cancellation of three contracts is justified, because (a) they were awarded as a result of negotiation and not as a result of open competitive bidding, as required by law, and are, therefore, illegal." (Postmaster General's report to President, p. 331.)

I am unofficially informed that the contract for route 41 has been canceled by mutual agreement.

## FOREIGN OCEAN-MAIL ROUTE 46

"This contract may be canceled without any offer of compensation for the following reasons: (a) This contract was a negotiated contract and awarded without authority; (b) the contract was illegally transferred and assigned to the subcontractor." (Postmaster General's report to President, p. 354.)

## FOREIGN OCEAN-MAIL ROUTE 53

"It is concluded that this contract may be canceled for the reason that it was not awarded as a result of competitive bidding, as provided by law \* \* \*." (Postmaster General's report to President, p. 373.)

## FOREIGN OCEAN-MAIL ROUTE 54

"This contract may be canceled without any offer of compensation for the reason (a) the contract was a negotiated one and was not awarded as a result of competitive bidding, as required by law." (Postmaster General's report to the President, p. 386.)

## FOREIGN OCEAN-MAIL ROUTE 55

"This contract may be canceled on two grounds. First, under the provisions of paragraph 5 (e) of the contract. \* \* \* Second, under the provisions of the paragraph 5 (b) of the contract. \* \* \*." (Postmaster General's report to President, p. 392.)

It is, therefore, contended that these specified foreign ocean-mail contracts should be considered voidable ab initio, and further payments from the United States in connection therewith should be stopped.

In my letter to you dated February 6, this general question, without detail, was brought to your attention. In your reply thereto, dated February 8, you stated:

"You do not state the particular contracts which have been found to have been awarded without competitive bids as required by the Merchant Marine Act of 1928, and if you will advise me thereof the matter will be promptly examined into."

This letter furnishes the specific information requested by your letter dated February 8 and is submitted in full confidence that "the matter will be promptly examined into." I am sure you will agree with me in the general position that sound public policy does not permit continuation in any form of contracts let in violation of law. It is submitted for your consideration that these specific contracts were let in violation of the law, and, therefore, payments thereon should be disallowed.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD C. MORAN, Jr., M. C.

Mr. PARKS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PARKS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 11035, the War Department appropriation bill, 1937, had come to no resolution thereon.

## THE FORTHCOMING NEUTRALITY BILL

Mr. SHANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHANLEY. Mr. Speaker, the paramount all-pervading principle in all this neutrality legislation is the necessity right now at the start for determining whether or no our philosophy of neutrality demands that we contemplate changes of our laws in the midst of conflict, for which it seeks to legislate. It seems to me that we must make that decision before we analyze the bill's contents.

With your indulgence I wish to present this question to you in as fair a manner as is possible to show both sides of this all-important question.

I present a colloquy between Mr. TINKHAM, of Massachusetts, and Mr. Hackworth, of the State Department, on a specific example of this case, but still indicative of the general rule.

[Neutrality hearings, Foreign Affairs Committee, 1936]

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Hackworth, I wish to ask another question. What do you think of the wisdom of passing this legislation with a war on between Italy and Abyssinia? Do you think such legislation should be passed if there were a war in progress between two great powers?

Mr. HACKWORTH. So long as we apply our policy equally, I do not think either belligerent would have any just ground for complaint. We know that belligerents change their contraband lists from time to time as the war progresses. They endeavor by those lists to circumscribe neutral rights with respect to the shipment of these commodities. If belligerents can change their position during the progress of the war, why cannot neutrals? This, of course, is subject to the condition that the neutrals must make their policy or their law apply equally to all the belligerents. It cannot be said on the basis of law or reason that a neutral must determine upon its whole attitude or policy and course of action as regards a given war at the outbreak of that war, and that that policy and course of action must remain static thereafter. This would in effect amount to placing the neutral in a strait jacket, so to speak. A different situation would obtain if the neutral acted at the behest of one of the belligerents. In such a situation it would be favoring the belligerent making the request and hence might be regarded as unneutral.

It is interesting to note that Mr. Hackworth brings out the fact that belligerents change their laws and he impliedly says that neutrals may do so too, so long as they apply those changes equally.

Do neutrals change their laws?

We quote from the testimony of Prof. Edwin M. Borchard, certainly one of the foremost practical authorities in the whole world. This is his comment on section 3 of the McReynolds bill:

Sec. 3. Prohibition on export of arms, etc.: If we must have arms embargoes, perhaps they ought automatically to apply upon the proclamation of the President that war exists, and not "upon the outbreak" or "during the progress" of any war. "During the progress" gives considerable Executive discretion possibly not here intended. The draftsmanship is poor. The Nye bill is preferable in this respect.

Now, here is the view of Prof. Charles Cheney Hyde, another authority of well-recognized scholarship and renown:

Mr. GRAY. Are you in favor of not changing an embargo during the continuance of a war either by the President or by Congress?

Professor HYDE. That is a difficult thing to do. I am glad I have not the responsibility of being on this committee.

Along a different line apparently but still indicative of what this witness thought of the necessity for mandatory legislation at the beginning of a conflict is this extract:

Mr. TINKHAM. Are you, as a matter of policy, in favor of the Chief Executive having broad optional power or are you in favor of legislation which is, in a general way, mandatory?

Professor HYDE. I have given that a lot of thought and I feel that the latter is preferable.

Mr. TINKHAM. That is, it should be mandatory?

Professor HYDE. Yes, sir; because otherwise it puts too heavy a burden on the President. It makes it necessary for him to make a decision, and that is the hardest thing a man can do—to make those changes. I think that is such a serious burden that that should be left to Congress. Yet, after you have once decided what articles should not go out, that should stick.

Apparently the professor wished to enlarge upon this thought and give his more seriously considered ideas a chance to find expression for in his memorandum, which he added, he has the following additaments concerning this mooted question.

Accordingly, it is suggested that in the proposed act restrictions of every kind upon the use of American resources for belligerent purposes should be made automatic in their operation, applicable, whenever possible, upon the outbreak of war, and remain unchanged throughout the duration of the conflict, so long as the United States remains a neutral. Solid practical reasons seem to justify this conclusion. Affirmative changes by a neutral state in its embargo policies, either after the outbreak or during the continuance of a war, are likely to affect the opposing belligerents unequally; and the chief belligerent sufferer is bound to complain that the neutral action is a direct attempt to penalize it and so weaken its chances of success.

This is true despite clean motives on the part of the neutral, and notwithstanding the fact that it may take such steps without necessarily violating a legal duty toward either contestant. The grave consequences that may result from arousing the conviction

of a friendly though belligerent state that affirmative neutral action taken after the beginning of a war has robbed it of the fruits of victory may cause a country such as our own to hesitate long before it goes the whole way, and by affirmative legislative action makes a radical change in its trade relationships with a particular belligerent which its law existing prior to the outbreak of the conflict did not contemplate. Such considerations demand, therefore, careful consideration by the Congress of the question whether the operation of sections 4 and 5 of House Joint Resolution 422 should not await the termination of the present war between Ethiopia and Italy, and so be confined in their operations to future conflicts when and as they afflict the world after the enactment of the proposed law.

Representative MAVERICK, of Texas, student of the entire subject and author in this House of the Nye-Clark-Maverick bill, adds this comment:

The travel of American passengers on belligerent ships was allowed during the World War, and Americans traveled on ammunition-laden ships, always an enemy target. The administration at the time found it impossible to change its policy to forbid this practice, because it had not been announced at the beginning of the war. That is the reason it ought to be done now.

Representative KOPPLEMANN, energetic and interested with a bill of his own displaying study and clear thought, added this:

That is your statement of it, but if you are asking me the question, let me say this to you, that I do not believe, under my bill or under any bill that your committee favorably reports and becomes a law, the President of the United States would at this stage of affairs, place an embargo on oil, so far as the countries now at war are concerned.

Representative HEALEY, of Massachusetts, vigorous exponent of "no changes during conflict", testified before the committee:

It has always been considered that neutrality has followed principles of international law. For a neutral to alter or change its policies once a war is in progress so as to affect unequally one belligerent or another is contrary to accepted practices and precedents of international law and may constitute a hostile or unneutral act toward the belligerent so affected.

Representative HEALEY introduced the famous statement of President Woodrow Wilson which is passing current inspection these days:

I am quoting now the letter which was written by Mr. Wilson: " \* \* \* Of course, we are arguing only to the special case, and are absolutely unanswerable in our position that these things cannot be done while a war is in progress against the parties to it." \* \* \*

In other words, that is, to change the policy with respect to shipment of munitions. This position was later expressly declared in the well-known note to Germany in 1915, in the course of which the United States stated:

"This Government holds—and is constrained to hold in view of the present indisputable doctrines of accepted international law—that any change in its own laws of neutrality during the progress of a war which would unequally affect the relations of the United States with the nations at war would be an unjustifiable departure from the principle of strict neutrality by which it has consistently sought to direct its actions. The placing of an embargo on the trade in arms at the present time would constitute such a change and be a direct violation of the neutrality of the United States."

Dr. Stoddard, publicist and son of the widely known lecturer, said:

In regard to this particular situation, this particular fracas, that is going on in East Africa, which is clearly localized and, as was said by one of the witnesses yesterday, essentially a colonial war, I think that that particular situation ought to be recognized and that this legislation ought not to apply.

But I think it ought to be very clearly set forth that if any other belligerents join in that war, in effect, it becomes a different kind of war and that then it would apply to all belligerents, including Italy and Ethiopia.

I do think the Italian Government has a just ground for complaint if we pass this bill and apply these conditions to Italy and Ethiopia, to that localized situation. I think that ought to be taken care of. Because, after all, gentlemen, it either is going to remain a localized war, in which case it would not have much practical effect on us, anyway, or it is going to broaden out into a greater war. So that if you frame your legislation with that in view, if it does remain a local war, you avoid incurring the enmity of the Italian Government and the Italian people; and if it broadens out into a great war, that situation is taken care of.

He added:

We are concerned with two things. Primarily we are concerned with the interests of the United States. But, at the same time—and I get back to my thesis that I started out with—we are striv-

ing to treat this matter in order to attain realism and justice. It seems to me that we do an injustice to Italy by changing the rules of the game during the progress of the war. We ought to have taken care of this matter, or, we might well have taken care of this matter, last summer. But it was not done.

Our own precedents in this country show the following with most of them selected from the Policy of the United States Toward Maritime Commerce in War, an issue of the State Department based on documents in its files and archives.

Page 41: On January 20, 1915, the Secretary of State held that the duty of a neutral to restrict trade in munitions had never been imposed by international law or by municipal statute. Three months later he informed the German Ambassador that the placing of an embargo on the "trade in arms" would be a direct violation of the neutrality of the United States, as it would unequally affect the relations of the United States with the belligerents.

In a communication of June 29, 1915, the Austro-Hungarian Government urged that the United States should adopt measures to "maintain an attitude of strict parity with respect to both belligerent parties" in regard to the exportation of munitions.

Secretary Lansing stated to the President that although this communication could be merely acknowledged, it offered an excellent opportunity to make to the American people a convincing statement of the attitude of their Government. A reply would be addressed to Vienna, but home consumption would be the real purpose. He was convinced of the strength of the position of the Government and of the desirability of making a frank public statement in order to remove the opposition to sales of munitions.

The Secretary reiterated these opinions on August 2 when he sent to the President a draft of reply to the Austro-Hungarian Government. He urged a speedy transmission of the reply, believing that it would have a beneficial effect upon public opinion. It was "our first opportunity to present in a popular way the reasons why we should not restrict the exportation of munitions of war." He mentioned that meetings were being held looking to the imposition of an embargo on arms and ammunition, and that propaganda being conducted on the subject might become embarrassing to the Government.

Page 42: In the communication to the Austro-Hungarian Government, sent on August 12, Secretary Lansing declared that the United States could not accede to Austria-Hungary's "assertion of an obligation to change or modify the rules of international usage." He stated that although the principle urged by the Austro-Hungarian Government related only to arms and ammunition, if this principle were sound, it should apply to all articles of contraband. A belligerent controlling the high seas might possess an ample supply of arms and ammunition, but be in want of food and clothing. On the "novel principle" that equalization was a neutral duty, neutral nations would be obligated to place an embargo on these articles because one of the belligerents could not obtain them through commercial intercourse.

The Secretary mentioned that during the years preceding the war Austria-Hungary and Germany had sold arms and ammunition to belligerents. Therefore, he believed that the United States could not be considered unneutral in continuing its legitimate trade in war supplies, even though the circumstances of war prevented Austria-Hungary from obtaining them from the American markets which were open to all belligerents alike, so far as the action and policy of the United States were concerned.

Page 43: The Secretary concluded that the principles of international law, the practice of nations, the national safety of the United States, the prevention of increased armies and navies, the adoption of peaceful methods for the adjustment of international differences, and finally, neutrality itself were opposed to the prohibition by neutrals of the exportation of arms and ammunition to belligerent powers during the progress of the war.

Eleven months later the Department of State reiterated its position that no obligation rested upon the United States to prevent all trade in contraband; that it would be unneutral for the United States to adopt such a policy.

Woodrow Wilson and the World War, by Charles Seymour, page 44: The inability of the Central Powers to import arms from the United States resulted from their inferiority on the high seas; the Government would be departing from its position of impartiality if it failed to keep American markets open to every nation of the world, belligerent or neutral. The United States could not change the rules in the middle of the game for the advantage of one side. The perfect legality of Wilson's decision has been frankly recognized since the war by the German Ambassador.

Why We Fought, by C. Hartley Grattan, page 150—German protest on sale of munitions to Allies: To this letter Secretary Bryan replied in part:

This Government holds, as I believe Your Excellency is aware, and as it is constrained to hold in view of the present indisputable doctrines of accepted international law, that any change in its own laws of neutrality during the progress of a war which would effect unequally the relations of the United States with the nations at war would be an unjustifiable departure from the principle of strict neutrality by which it has consistently sought to direct its actions, and I respectfully submit that none of the circumstances, urged in Your Excellency's memorandum, alters the principle involved.

#### America on Armed Merchantmen, President Wilson:

But in any event our duty is clear. No nation, no group of nations, has the right, while war is in progress, to alter or disregard the principles which all nations have agreed upon in mitigation of the horrors and sufferings of war; and if the clear rights of American citizens should very unhappily be abridged or denied by any such action we should, it seems to me, have in honor no choice as to what our own course should be.

In the House the Committee on Foreign Affairs reported the McLemore resolution with a recommendation that it be tabled because it was the President's business to conduct foreign relations and the House ought not to interfere. On this basis the House voted to table the resolution. Furthermore, were not editorial writers, and so forth.

Armed merchantmen: Secretary explained that the United States admitted the legal right of merchant vessels to arm for the sole purpose of defense, but felt that there should be a change in the existing rule of international law permitting them to arm. Nevertheless, the United States did not feel that during the war it could change the established rule without the assent of the contending belligerents. The proposal of January 18 to the Entente powers he stated had been made in the interest of obtaining for humanity's sake assent to the removal of all armament from merchant ships.

The following extract illustrates the attitude in the highly controversial armed merchantmen doctrine as taken from page 71, "The policy of the United States toward maritime commerce in war":

Germany declared on February 8, 1916, that armed enemy merchant vessels no longer had any right to be considered as peaceable commercial vessels and that German naval forces would receive orders to treat them as belligerents.

A week later Secretary Lansing announced that if Americans should lose their lives in a submarine attack which came without warning upon a belligerent merchantman armed solely for defense, the act would be regarded as a breach of international law. He stated that there was then no intention to warn Americans to refrain from traveling on belligerent merchantmen armed solely for defense.

The Secretary explained that the United States admitted the legal right of merchant vessels to arm for the sole purpose of defense but felt that there should be a change in the existing rule of international law permitting them to arm. Nevertheless, the United States did not feel that during the war it could change the established rule without the assent of the contending belligerents. The proposal of January 18 to the Entente Powers, he stated, had been made in the interest of obtaining "for humanity's sake" assent to the removal of all armament from merchant ships. He hoped they would accept the proposal but until they did there was no intention to submit it to the Central Powers. If the proposal was not accepted, the United States would "rely upon the present established rule of international law that merchant ships are entitled to armament for defensive purposes only."

Resolutions were soon considered in Congress to warn American citizens against traveling upon armed merchantmen of belligerents. In a letter of February 24 to Senator Stone, chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, President Wilson made known his view on the proposition. He could not consent to any abridgment of the rights of American citizens. To forbid the American people to exercise their rights for fear the Nation might be called upon to vindicate them would be an implicit acquiescence in the violation of the rights of mankind and a deliberate abdication of the position of the American people as spokesmen "for the law and the right."

James W. Garner, certainly not biased against the Allies, professor of the University of Illinois, in his two volumes, International Law and the World War, has the following to say concerning a very closely related set of circumstances:

Legality of the alteration of the rule during war: But admitting that considerations of morality and the spirit of neutrality outweigh the inconveniences and dangers to which certain neutral states would be exposed by an abrogation of the existing rule, the question arises when and how should the rule be altered? The right of a neutral power to prohibit, at the outbreak of a war, the exportation of arms and munitions from its territory is universally admitted; but may it do so during the progress of the war after one of the belligerents by means of his superior naval strength has succeeded in commercially isolating his adversary and cutting off his access to neutral markets?

If a neutral government upon the outbreak of war announces that its markets will be open on equal terms to all belligerents, and subsequently when one belligerent has driven the naval forces of his enemy from the seas and blockaded his ports the neutral decides to close its markets to all belligerents, would not the effect be to nullify in large degree the victory achieved by the one belligerent by depriving him of an advantage honestly won? Has the latter not a right to expect, as von Bar says, that the relations between the neutral and his adversary shall not be changed to his own disadvantage?

The general opinion of the authorities is that such a change would not only not be consistent with the maintenance of an attitude of neutrality but, on the contrary, it would, in effect, amount to giving assistance to the belligerent who in consequence of the fortunes of war has been excluded by his enemy from recourse to neutral markets. The true principle was stated by Secretary Lansing in his communication to the Austro-Hungarian Government. In this communication the Secretary said:

"This Government holding, as I believe Your Excellency is aware, and as it is constrained to hold in view of the present indisputable doctrines of accepted international law, that any change in its own laws of neutrality during the progress of a war which would affect unequally the relations of the United States with the nations at war would be an unjustifiable departure from the principle of strict neutrality, submits that none of the circumstances urged in Your Excellency's memorandum alters the principle involved. The placing of an embargo on the trade in arms at the present time would constitute such a change and be a direct violation of the neutrality of the United States. It will, I feel assured, be clear to Your Excellency that, holding this view and considering itself in honor bound by it, it is out of the question for this Government to consider such a course."

This view is that held by the leading jurists and text writers. To cite only one of many, Westlake, advertizing to Earl Granville's statement to Count Bernstorff in 1870 that "Her Majesty's Government would be prepared to enter into consultation with other nations as to the possibility of adopting in common a stricter rule", observed that "at least, whether or not such a consultation may follow the conclusion of the present war, it must be allowed that to change an existing rule to the prejudice of one belligerent during the war, and that in compliance with the express request of the other belligerent that our neutrality should be more favorable to him, would be a clear breach of neutrality, even although there might be the most excellent reasons for giving a general preference to the new rule on future occasions."

But, it was asserted by those who argued that an alteration of the rule by a neutral during the progress of the war would constitute no violation of neutral duty, most of the neutral powers of Europe had in fact prohibited the exportation of arms, munitions, and other commodities of war from their territories. The answer to this argument is that those embargoes, as has already been stated, were not intended as neutrality measures but measures of conservation and defense, proposed American embargo. Moreover, as was pointed out by Senator Lodge in the course of a debate in the Senate, the effect of the European embargoes was in no case to alter the existing situation as between the several belligerents by depriving one of an advantage already gained, whereas the proposed American embargo would in fact have cut off the supply of but one belligerent and its allies without affecting the other. In the language of the Senator it would have been "worth more than a million men to Germany." The argument that the action of President Wilson in 1914, in lifting an embargo which had been laid in 1912 on the exportation of arms to Mexico, constituted a precedent in support of the contention that the rule may be changed during the progress of a war was without weight because the situation in the two cases was not analogous.

The Collected Papers of John Westlake on Public International Law gives the views of this distinguished scholar, who died April 14, 1913, after a life which was noted for its emphasis on international-law researches. The aforementioned article quoted above from the book of James W. Garner was written in 1870 and is worth the eclectic student's study. It is an amazing anticipation of many of the problems of today and one is richly repaid in encountering the mind of this cogent thinker of the Victorian era.

In the familiar saying of Mark Pattison, "A man who does not know what has been thought by those who have gone

before him is sure to set an undue value upon his own ideas", we may find much that is true in reading these sages of that period.

We wish to present some passages in *Road to War*, Walter Millis' provocative book. It is interesting to point out that Mr. Millis pays a book from which we have already quoted a splendid tribute. In the preface of his book there is this statement:

The only book I know of specifically devoted to the reasons for the American entry into the European conflict is C. Hartley Grattan's *Why We Fought*, published in 1929. I have availed myself of Mr. Grattan's work, though my own approach has been a rather different one.

May I add that it is difficult in offering these extracts to permit a thoroughly precise or studious presentation of all the facts directly and indirectly prompting the statement? No one can hope to paint the picture in its entirety, displaying that prejudice, this whim, or that one of many reasons that surround a conclusion.

A study that would pursue all the subtle threads from Dan to Beersheba might be complete, but it would run into many a cul de sac and many a spur track that would be destructive of the main theme. We have observed before that few discoveries are more painful than those which expose the pedigree of ideas.

Another recent book, *Road to War*, by Walter Millis, at page 99:

When Congress convened in December it was to meet a flood of bills calling for an embargo upon the export of munitions.

The leading bill was introduced by Senator Hitchcock, of Nebraska, a pillar of the Democratic majority. Unfortunately, the movement was presented as one of humanitarian idealism rather than as a severely practical way of preserving the United States from involvement in the war. Even more unfortunately it at once enlisted the enthusiastic support of the pro-German minority. They plunged into a propaganda campaign which made it only too easy to discredit the whole idea as mere Teutonic treachery; besides, the sale of munitions was lucrative. Even so, Spring-Rice, always nervous, took instant alarm. He hurried off adroit warnings to Grey. Should the administration threaten to support the embargo, he suggested, "it will become necessary to point out that such unneutral action will disqualify the Government from the office of impartial mediator. And this impartial mediation is the most cherished ambition of the President." On December 11 Sir Edward "unofficially" suggested that the Hitchcock bill "would be special legislation passed while war is in progress, making a radical departure from a long-established custom", and so a definitely "unneutral act." Loudly the Allies and their American sympathizers reechoed this view, and Mr. Bryan soon reassured Spring-Rice that the Hitchcock bill was without administration endorsement. Curiously enough, no one appeared to notice that Sir Edward, at the very moment that he protested the "unneutral act", was forcing the European neutrals to adopt precisely the same sort of munitions embargo. But in their case it worked in favor of the Allies.

Thus Mr. Wilson missed a valuable opportunity. There was really nothing whatever in international law to forbid a munitions embargo applying equally to all belligerents. To have supported the measure would, of course, have opened the President to a furious attack from the pro-ally Americans and from the gentlemen who were getting the munitions contracts; at the time, however, few if any munitions had actually been exported, and the embargo would not have been the body blow either to American prosperity or to the allied war effort which it would have been later on. The export of raw materials and commercial supplies would have supported all the prosperity we needed; the Allies would have been driven sooner to organize their own munitions manufacture, as the Germans did, and the net result might well have been far more satisfactory to them as well as to the United States. Doubtless the Germans would still have resented the commercial exports, but without the deep sting of bitterness which came with the thought that one's son had been eviscerated by a shrapnel shell made in America. Afterward, when a great munitions industry had been organized in the United States and the Allies were dependent upon it in earnest, it was too late; at the time we might have preserved a much greater share of practical neutrality at relatively small cost.

Foreign Affairs, January 1936. Pages 212 to 213, by Charles Warren:

It was on this account that Secretary Lansing, fully conscious that international law could not be changed during a war by either belligerent or by the United States as a neutral, suggested to the Allied Powers his famous modus vivendi in a note dated January 18, 1916. What he proposed was that as a temporary compromise the one side should relinquish its right to arm its merchant vessels and the other in return should relinquish its right to attack without warning. He set forth the situation with succinct clarity, as follows:

This right seems to have been predicated on the superior defensive strength of ships of war and the limitation of armament to have been dependent on the fact that it could not be used effectively in offense against enemy naval vessels, while it could defend the merchantman against the generally inferior armament of piratical ships and privateers. The use of the submarine, however, has changed these relations. Comparison of the defensive strength of a cruiser and a submarine shows that the latter, relying for protection on its power to submerge, is almost defenseless in point of construction. Even a merchant ship carrying a small caliber gun would be able to use it effectively for offense against a submarine. \* \* \* Consequently the placing of guns on merchantmen of a purpose to render merchantmen superior in force to submarines and to prevent warning and visit and search by them. Any armament, therefore, on a merchant vessel would seem to have the character of an offensive armament. \* \* \* If a submarine is required to stop and search a merchant vessel on the high seas, and in case it is found that she is of enemy character and that conditions necessitate her destruction, to remove to a place of safety all persons on board, it would not seem just or reasonable that the submarine should be compelled, while complying with these requirements, to expose itself to almost certain destruction by the guns on board the merchant vessel.

International Law Chiefly as Interpreted and Applied by the United States, volume 2, by Charles Cheney Hyde (pp. 750-751):

Both Austria-Hungary and Germany contended in 1915 that by reason of the magnitude of American exportations of munitions of war and the circumstances that the United States was the only neutral country from which they could be obtained, it behooved its Government, if imbued with the "spirit of true neutrality", to effect a measure of intervention which would serve to lessen the detriment which the complainants suffered in consequence of inability to utilize the American market.<sup>1</sup>

Surprise was expressed by the Government of the United States at the implication that observance of the strict principles of international law under conditions developing during the war did not suffice. It declined, moreover, to accede to the suggestion that there was any obligation to change or modify "the rules of international usage" on account of special conditions confronting a particular belligerent. It declared that a neutral state was not burdened with the duty of applying a theory of equalization to the utilization of the resources of its territory. According to the Department of State, the only ground justifying a change of the rule, as set forth in the Hague Convention, was the necessity compelling a neutral power to do so in order to protect its own rights.

One of the most illuminating episodes in the history of neutrality was that of the militant stand of little Holland to ward off the epistolary, as well as the economic, pressure which was exerted to compel her to change her rules of neutrality. Vehemently would England write to protest against the rule of the Government of Netherlands, which excluded armed merchantmen from the ports of Holland. The French wrote, too, and so did we when we entered the war, but Holland was adamant and refused to yield at the very outbreak or during the progress of the war. She had determined to exclude belligerent armed merchantmen. In article 4 of the proclamation of Netherlands, enunciated on the 6th of August 1914, she forbade the entry of such belligerent armed merchantmen.

The French pleaded in vain that the methods of submarine warfare, the torpedoing of innocent vessels, the death of crews and cargoes were all causes that demanded the abolition of the rule of Holland, but the Government of the Netherlands did not yield. It is probably the most brilliant display of intellectual writing and sound reasoning in the history of international correspondence. Holland did not dispute the right of nations to arm their vessels within the understood code of international law. In fact, she admitted they could do that under the law of war, but she countered with the proposition that under the law of neutrality each had the right to set out its own standards.

Her stand saved her from massed attack and kept her harbors and territorial waters immune from the hostile contending belligerents. In addition it was a guaranty to the belligerents that the territorial waters of Holland would not be the base of either one side in the furtherance of that side's military program. Despite the entreaties of England, the

<sup>1</sup> Herr von Jagow, German Minister of Foreign Affairs, to Mr. Gerard, American Ambassador at Berlin, Feb. 16, 1915, American White Book, European War, I, 56; Memorandum from the German Embassy at Washington, Apr. 4, 1915, 73; Count Burian, Austro-Hungarian Minister of Foreign Affairs, to Mr. Penfield, American Ambassador at Vienna, June 29, 1915, II, 193; same to same, Sept. 24, 1915, IV, 105.

Holland policy, fashioned by a man named Strycken, remained unchanged—

Besides, a change in its attitude at the present time would be especially serious, because it would involve the revocation of a rule of neutrality laid down in the very beginning of the war and duly notified to both belligerents. Nothing could be more contrary to the very purposes of neutrality than to repeal a rule of neutrality which on the results of events, whatever they may be, is found to the disadvantage of that belligerent alone.

This statement of the policy of Holland sets out, of course, the necessity for the enunciation of the rules at the beginning of the conflict and then stresses the necessity of notification to the belligerents. It was also said that at the second peace conference the British peace delegation had insisted that the only chance to modify a rule of neutrality was the right to make it more strict.

I should like to close with a quotation from John Acton. I believe that in this legislation more than anything else we must keep our feet on the ground and not be slipping through gossamers of fanciful visions spun by wishes and hopes.

Whenever great intellectual cultivation has been combined with that suffering which is inseparable from extensive changes in the condition of the people men of speculative or imaginative genius have sought in the contemplation of an ideal society a remedy, or at least a consolation, for evils which they were practically unable to remove. Poetry has always preserved the idea that at some distant time or place, in the western islands or the Arcadian region, an innocent and contented people, free from the corruption and restraint of civilized life, have realized the legends of the golden age. The office of the poets is always nearly the same, and there is little variation in the features of their ideal world; but when philosophers attempt to admonish or reform mankind by devising an imaginary state their motive is more definite and immediate, and their commonwealth is a satire as well as a model. Plato and Plotinus, More and Campanella, constructed their fanciful societies with those materials which were omitted from the fabric of the actual communities by the defects of which they were inspired. the republic, the utopia, and the City of the Sun were protests against a state of things which the experience of their authors taught them to condemn, and from the faults of which they took refuge in the opposite extremes. They remained without influence, and have never passed from literary into political history, because something more than discontent and speculative ingenuity is needed in order to invest a political idea with power over the masses of mankind.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

Mr. LARRABEE, indefinitely, on account of serious illness in family.

Mr. FARLEY, for 5 days, on account of important business.

Mr. DISNEY (at the request of Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma), indefinitely, on account of the death of his former law partner, the late Judge Alcorn, of Tulsa, Okla.

Mr. BULWINKLE (at the request of Mr. DOUGHTON), for 2 weeks, on account of illness.

#### ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. PARSONS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 10464. An act making appropriations to provide urgent supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, and for prior fiscal years, and for other purposes.

#### THE LATE VICE PRESIDENT CURTIS

Mr. GUYER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### House Resolution 416

Resolved, That the House has learned with profound sensibility and sorrow of the death of Hon. Charles Curtis, former Vice President of the United States.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased this House do now adjourn.

The resolution was agreed to.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 11, 1936, at 12 o'clock noon.

**COMMITTEE HEARING  
PUBLIC LANDS**

The Committee on the Public Lands will hold hearings beginning at 10:30 o'clock a. m., considering H. R. 8137.

**EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.**

660. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV a letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide more effectively for the national defense by increasing the efficiency of the Air Corps of the Army, and for other purposes", approved July 2, 1926, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

**REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS**

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. PARKS: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 11035. A bill making appropriations for the military and nonmilitary activities of the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1979). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BLAND: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 9671. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to dispose of material to the sea-scout department of the Boy Scouts of America; with amendment (Rept. No. 1980). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

**REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS**

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. ROGERS of New Hampshire: Committee on Military Affairs. S. 1991. An act for the relief of Wilson G. Birmingham; without amendment (Rept. No. 1978). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

**CHANGE OF REFERENCE**

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 10946) to provide that the disabilities of Lawrence A. Ebert shall be held and considered to be service connected; Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 10947) to provide that the disabilities of Sam Pizula shall be held and considered to be service connected; Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

**PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS**

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. PARKS: A bill (H. R. 11035) making appropriations for the military and nonmilitary activities of the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BLAND (by request): A bill (H. R. 11036) to amend section 4321, Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 46, sec. 263), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BURNHAM: A bill (H. R. 11037) to provide for the construction by the Secretary of the Treasury of three Federal buildings for use as Naval Reserve armories on the Pacific coast; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11038) to authorize the construction by the Secretary of the Treasury of Federal buildings for use as armories for the Naval Reserve; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. CARTER: A bill (H. R. 11039) to authorize the acquisition of lands in the city of Alameda, county of Alameda, State of California, as a site for a naval air station,

and to authorize the construction and installation of a naval air station thereon; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. DICKSTEIN: A bill (H. R. 11040) to deport certain aliens who secured preference-quota or nonquota visas through fraud by contracting marriage solely to expedite entry to the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. DIMOND: A bill (H. R. 11041) to authorize the incorporated city of Klawock, Alaska, to construct, reconstruct, enlarge, extend, improve, and repair certain municipal public structures, utilities, works, and improvements, and for such purposes to issue bonds in any amount not exceeding \$20,000, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11042) authorizing a preliminary examination of the Matanuska River in the vicinity of Matanuska, Alaska; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. GASQUE: A bill (H. R. 11043) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Waccamaw River at or near Conway, S. C.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KOCIALKOWSKI: A bill (H. R. 11044) to provide a government for American Samoa; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BOEHNE: A bill (H. R. 11045) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River between Rockport, Ind., and Owensboro, Ky.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Utah: A bill (H. R. 11046) to facilitate the conservation of public lands and other natural resources by coordinating the executive agencies of the Government exercising functions in connection therewith, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. STEAGALL: A bill (H. R. 11047) relating to taxation of shares of preferred stock, capital notes, and debentures of banks while owned by Reconstruction Finance Corporation and reaffirming their immunity; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McSWAIN: Resolution (H. Res. 414) for the consideration of S. 2253; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, resolution (H. Res. 415) for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 484; to the Committee on Rules.

**PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS**

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CULKIN: A bill (H. R. 11048) to provide for the appointment of Harold E. Nelson as a second lieutenant, United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CROWE: A bill (H. R. 11049) to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to reappoint James P. Day in the police department of said District; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT: A bill (H. R. 11050) granting a pension to Julie Allen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GEARHART: A bill (H. R. 11051) for the relief of William Hays Hammond; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LEA of California: A bill (H. R. 11052) for the relief of Joseph M. Purrington; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McREYNOLDS: A bill (H. R. 11053) authorizing the President to present the Distinguished Service Medal to Commander Percy Tod, British Navy, and the Navy Cross to Lt. Comdr. Charles A. deW. Kitcat, British Navy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MILLARD (by request): A bill (H. R. 11054) for the relief of Adolph Schultz; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 11055) granting a pension to Jesse F. Crawford; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 11056) to place William W. Wade on the retired list of the United States Army as a major; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHANLEY: A bill (H. R. 11057) for the relief of Harry B. Bissell; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SNYDER of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 11058) granting an increase of pension to Georgianna K. Griest; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SOMERS of New York: A bill (H. R. 11059) granting a renewal of Patent No. 1150239, relating to an automatic burglar- and fire-alarm system and telephone service; to the Committee on Patents.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11060) granting a renewal of Patent No. 1145659, relating to an automatic selecting multiparty telephone system; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. WOLCOTT: A bill (H. R. 11061) for the relief of the estate of Elizabeth Purtill O'Brien; to the Committee on Claims.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

10023. By Mr. BIERMANN: Memorial of the Iowa Civil Liberties Union, resolving against the Tydings-McCormack disaffection bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

10024. By Mr. CULKIN: Petition of 28 residents of Georgetown, Madison County, N. Y., urging passage of House bill 8739, restoring to the District of Columbia its prohibition law; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

10025. Also, petition of the Propeller Club of the United States, port of Erie, protesting passage of House bills 6202, 6203, and 6189; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

10026. Also, petition of 66 residents of Jefferson County, New York State, served by star route no. 7594, urging that Congress pass legislation to indefinitely extend all existing star-route contracts and increase the compensation thereon to an equal basis with that paid for the other forms of mail transportation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

10027. By Mr. DEMPSEY: Petition requesting passage of the Hildebrandt bill (H. R. 7325) for the welfare, convenience, and fair compensation of star-route carriers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

10028. By Mr. HOPE: Petition of T. J. Walters and 68 others, by Johnson, Kans., urging the enactment of legislation placing star-route carriers on the same salary and working basis as rural carriers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

10029. Also, petition of Henry Hoor and 66 others, of Elkhart, Richfield, and Johnson, Kans., urging the enactment of legislation placing star-route carriers on the same salary and working basis as rural carriers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

10030. Also, petition of U. S. Bullard and 150 others, of Rolla, Kans., urging the enactment of legislation placing star-route carriers on the same salary and working basis as rural carriers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

10031. By Mr. GOODWIN: Petition of the New York State Legislature, memorializing Congress to enact such laws as will authorize the promulgation of rules by the Department of Justice or the Interstate Commerce Commission to compel the manufacturer of firearms to properly register them; also giving to the State the right to pass laws for the protection of its citizens in connection with the sale of firearms manufactured in another State; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

10032. Also, petition of 39 residents of Esperance and Delanson, N. Y., urging Congress to restore to the District of Columbia its prohibition law by passing House bill 8739; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

10033. By Mr. KENNEY: Resolution adopted by the Italian-American Citizens' League of Bergen County at its regular meeting held on January 21, 1936, petitioning Congress to reenact the neutrality legislation now in force and effect; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

10034. Also, petition of the Linden Junior High School Parent-Teacher Association, numbering 151 members, at its

regular meeting held on February 5, 1936, requesting that they endorse the Pettengill bill (H. R. 6472) and that it be brought before the House of Representatives for a hearing; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

10035. By Mr. KRAMER: Resolution of the California State Chamber of Commerce, of San Francisco, relative to the Pacific coast maritime strike, etc.; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

10036. By Mr. MEAD: Resolution of the Common Council of the City of Buffalo, N. Y., requesting that Congress give serious consideration to the bill of Representative KENNEY, of New Jersey, which proposes a national lottery, so that money could be raised without recourse to inflation or additional taxes for payment of the soldiers' adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

10037. By Mr. PATMAN: Resolution of the board of governors of the Michigan Bakers' Association, Inc., favoring the principles of House bill 8442; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

10038. By Mr. PFEIFER: Petition of the Grand Lodge of the State of New York, Order Sons of Italy in America, New York City, concerning continuing the existing neutrality law; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

10039. Also, petition of the Senate of the State of New York, Albany, concerning the illegal sale and possession of firearms; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

10040. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the National Aero-nautic Association; to the Committee on Rules.

#### SENATE

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 11, 1936

*(Legislative day of Thursday, Jan. 16, 1936)*

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

#### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. ROBINSON, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Monday, February 10, 1936, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 10929) to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act with respect to excepted employment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also communicated to the Senate the resolutions of the House adopted as a tribute to the memory of Hon. Charles Curtis, former Vice President of the United States.

#### ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 10464) making appropriations to provide urgent supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, and for prior fiscal years, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the Vice President.

#### 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	Barkley	Bullock	Carey
Ashurst	Benson	Bulow	Chavez
Austin	Black	Burke	Clark
Bachman	Bone	Byrd	Connally
Bailey	Borah	Byrnes	Coolidge
Barbour	Brown	Caraway	Copeland