

petitioning for relief therefrom through action of the Congress; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2614. By Mr. CRAWFORD: Petition of 152 residents of Ionia County, Mich., asking prompt enactment of the Frazier-Lemke refinancing bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2615. Also, petition of 211 residents of Shiawassee, Mich., asking prompt enactment of the Frazier-Lemke refinancing bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2616. Also, petition of a number of residents of Saginaw County, Mich., asking prompt enactment of the Frazier-Lemke refinancing bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2617. Also, petition of a number of residents of Montcalm County, Mich., asking prompt enactment of the Frazier-Lemke refinancing bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2618. Also, petition of certain residents of the Eighth District of Michigan, asking for the passage of the McGroarty old-age pension bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2619. By Mr. MOTT: Senate Joint Memorial No. 10 of the Thirty-eighth Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, petitioning Congress to provide funds to clear dead timber, debris, etc., from Crane Prairie Reservoir site in Deschutes County, Oreg.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2620. Also, House Joint Memorial No. 5 of the Thirty-eighth Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, petitioning Congress to pass appropriate legislation to provide military defense for the State of Oregon and the Pacific northwest; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2621. Also, Senate Joint Memorial No. 16 of the Thirty-eighth Legislative Assembly, State of Oregon, petitioning the President of the United States and the Secretary of State of the United States to refrain from declaring any reduction of the present tariff rates on filberts, shelled or unshelled, to the end that this industry of the Pacific northwest may be protected fully and amply against destructive foreign competition; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2622. Also, Senate Joint Memorial No. 8 of the Thirty-eighth Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, petitioning Congress to refrain from reduction of present tariff on cherries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2623. Also, Senate Joint Memorial No. 8 of the Thirty-eighth Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, petitioning Congress to make appropriation for the eradication of Bang's disease among cattle; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2624. Also, House Joint Memorial No. 2 of the Thirty-eighth Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, providing for segregating the costs of navigation and electrical energy on the Bonneville project, Oregon; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2625. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Pittsburg Division, No. 93, of the Order of Benefit Association of Railway Employees; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE

TUESDAY, MARCH 5, 1935

(Legislative day of Monday, Mar. 4, 1935)

The Senate met, in executive session, 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, March 4, 1935, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

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 without amendment the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 46) authorizing and directing the Federal Communications Commission to investigate and report on the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. and on all other companies engaged directly or indirectly in telephone com-

munication in interstate commerce, including all companies related to any of these companies through a holding-company structure, or otherwise.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 3808. An act to authorize the incorporated town of Seward, Alaska, to undertake certain municipal public works, including the construction of an electric generating station and electric distribution systems, and for such purposes to issue bonds in any sum not exceeding \$118,000;

H. R. 4751. An act to amend section 24 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, with respect to the terms of office of members of the Interstate Commerce Commission;

H. R. 6084. An act to authorize the city of Ketchikan, Alaska, to issue bonds in any sum not to exceed \$1,000,000 for the purpose of acquiring the electric light and power, water, and telephone properties of the Citizens' Light, Power & Water Co., and to finance and operate the same, and validating the preliminary proceedings with respect thereto, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 134. Joint resolution to continue the Commission for Determining the Boundary Line Between the District of Columbia and the State of Virginia for not to exceed 1 additional year, and to authorize not to exceed \$10,000 additional funds for its expenses.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled joint resolution (S. J. Res. 46) authorizing and directing the Federal Communications Commission to investigate and report on the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. and on all other companies engaged directly or indirectly in telephone communication in interstate commerce, including all companies related to any of these companies through a holding-company structure or otherwise, and it was signed by the Vice President.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. BLACK obtained the floor.

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	Copeland	Keyes	Radcliffe
Ashurst	Costigan	King	Reynolds
Austin	Couzens	La Follette	Robinson
Bachman	Cutting	Logan	Russell
Bailey	Dickinson	Loneragan	Schall
Bankhead	Dieterich	Long	Schwollenbach
Barbour	Donahey	McAdoo	Sheppard
Bilbo	Duffy	McCarran	Shipstead
Black	Fletcher	McGill	Smith
Bone	Frazier	McKellar	Stelwer
Borah	George	McNary	Thomas, Okla.
Brown	Gerry	Maloney	Thomas, Utah
Bulkley	Gibson	Minton	Townsend
Bulow	Glass	Moore	Trammell
Burke	Gore	Murphy	Truman
Byrd	Guffey	Murray	Tydings
Byrnes	Hale	Neely	Vandenberg
Capper	Harrison	Norbeck	Van Nuys
Carey	Hastings	Norris	Wagner
Clark	Hatch	Nye	Walsh
Connally	Hayden	O'Mahoney	Wheeler
Coolidge	Johnson	Pope	White

Mr. ROBINSON. I announce that my colleague the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY] and the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] are absent because of illness, and that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN] are necessarily detained.

Mr. AUSTIN. I wish to announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. METCALF] are necessarily detained from the Senate.

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

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads I report favorably the nominations of sundry postmasters. Among these nominations are

postmasters in Minnesota—from January 17 to February 6. Senator SHIPSTEAD has approved the reports. We notified Senator SCHALL about them on February 19 and March 1, and put a time limit in which he was to report to the committee, as of Monday March 4. We have heard nothing from Senator SCHALL in reply to our two letters. I, therefore, report the nominations favorably.

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

NOMINATION OF GEN. RICHARD P. WILLIAMS

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Richard P. Williams to be brigadier general in the Marine Corps?

GEN. JOHN H. RUSSELL

Mr. BLACK. Mr. President, it is my desire at this time to address myself to the question of the confirmation of the nomination of Gen. John H. Russell and to the method of selection adopted by General Russell, with a view, at a later step in the proceedings, to move to recommit the nomination of General Russell and to have a vote upon it, and with the additional intention of moving to recommit to the Committee on Naval Affairs certain nominations involving promotions that have been recommended by boards, with the request that the Naval Affairs Committee be granted a sufficient appropriation to summon witnesses to appear before that committee to determine whether injustices have been done by reason of the method of selection. I do not mean by that to state that I desire to have the Naval Affairs Committee or the Senate act as a board of review on these nominations. I believe, however, that the facts will show that the nominations should be rejected at this time or sent back to the executive department, with instructions that a fair and impartial board be appointed, on which General Russell shall not sit, to determine whether the officers so selected have been selected after a fair and just appraisal of the records they have made in the Marine Corps.

I can give to the Senate at this time a short quotation from one of the numerous communications which I have received which prompts me to believe that any other course would be unfair and unjust both to the officers of the Marine Corps and to the people of this Nation who desire to have this branch of the military service operate with the highest possible morale, in order that they may be ready to defend the country, if they should be called upon to do so. I do not believe it is possible to reach the conclusion that more than 50 percent of the higher officers of the Marine Corps are disqualified to continue to serve in that capacity unless we reach the conclusion at the same time that something has been seriously and fundamentally wrong with the administration of that branch of our military service.

I desire to read to the Senate at this time a portion of a letter. I shall not read all of it. It will give some idea of the sentiment of the officers of the Marine Corps with reference to this particular selection board. May I invite attention at this time to the fact that this is the second board headed by General Russell which has passed upon selections.

General Russell is now sponsoring legislation which will automatically retire from the Marine Corps practically every one of the officers who has been passed over by the two boards; so that if the entire program and plan shall go through it will mean that these officers will not only be prevented from having a promotion, many of whom have served through the basic schools, have gone through the Army War College, and upon whom the Government has spent thousands and thousands of dollars, but they will be automatically ejected from the Marine Corps after action by a board which they believe, and which many officers who have not been passed over believe, have not had a fair representation of those who should have been utilized to pass upon these officers.

Let me read a part of this letter:

Too old to begin a new profession—

May I state that I do not know this man. I do not know where he is from. I have never seen him.

Too old to begin a new profession and with a family to support, I am thrown out in disgrace and for no cause which is apparent to me. Once a soldier, always a soldier, is especially applicable to the Marine Corps; and if America does not stand by us who have stood by her, we will be in the position of men without a country.

I have lived through 10 years of amoebic dysentery, dengue, and malaria fevers, frequent separations from my family, earthquakes in Nicaragua, and carry as souvenirs a bullet in my steel helmet in China and one in my coat sleeve in Nicaragua when my horse was shot from under me.

His horse was shot, it seems. It was shot at 20 times and missed.

These things are all part of the job. I ask no special consideration from the American people because of them, but it is far fairer to them to allow me to continue to work at a job for which I have been trained at their expense and in which I am capable of being useful, indeed valuable, than to pay me some \$60 per month for the rest of my life with no return to them.

It does not solve my difficulties nor is it just to the people. It is the birthright of every American to work. If the President takes away from us the job for which we are specially fitted, simply because of the personal antagonism of a little group of willful men who wish to control the Marine Corps, then we are indeed lost, and God only knows where it all will end. I cannot believe the President, with his eminently sane outlook, will allow this state of affairs to continue.

That there has been no judgment used in the selection, let me cite the case of another officer in my class.

He cites several officers. I shall be very careful in reading this letter in order to make sure, as I conceive it, that nothing goes in the Record from which the individual may be identified. If any Senator desires to see the entire letter, I shall be delighted to let him read it and any of the numerous other letters which I have in my files of the same tenor.

I feel that I need not point out, my dear Senator, that it is absolutely vital to me that this letter be considered entirely confidential, since it is evident that I dare not further incur the enmity of these officers. To do so would be certain to place my head on the official chopping block and have it neatly sliced off.

It is because of a situation of that kind, affecting men whom I do not know, whom I have not seen, but who have served their country both here and abroad, that I am presenting to the Senate these facts, in the belief that if the Senate will hear them and if the Senate will act upon them free from any influence except the desire to see that these men who served their country shall be given a fair and square deal, the Senate will require that these nominations be sent back to the committee and that a full and complete investigation be had.

It may be said that the Committee on Naval Affairs have investigated. I make no criticism of the investigation by the Naval Affairs Committee; but I do state that unless the committee shall be given an appropriation and shall be authorized to summon Marine Corps officers, requiring them to come and thereby giving them the protection of a summons and the coercive measures of this body, that committee will not be able to arrive at the truth. I gave them, for instance, the name of a very efficient and capable officer, according to all the information I had received, who is now stationed in New Orleans. He was requested to come. He declined to do so. I had direct and positive information that that officer could give very valuable facts in connection with the controversies which have arisen on the floor here and in connection with the controversy concerning promotions.

Mr. President, before proceeding further with reference to the promotion question, in order that we may dispose of it and since it has come up with reference to General Russell in connection with the confirmation of his nomination, perhaps it would be wise for me first to discuss very briefly the so-called "battle of Russell's run." The statement has been made in some instances that that should not have been brought up in this connection. It was brought up by a witness under oath. It was testified to by a witness who was under oath and who was present on the occasion. The fact that he was present can be confirmed by anyone who desires to read the personal reminiscences of Maj. Gen. John A. Lejeune, published by Doran & Co., and copyrighted in 1930. General Lejeune referred there to this so-called "battle of El Tejar."

The evidence as to that incident is conflicting. Gen. Smedley Butler testified that he was present; that he rushed

up there one Sunday morning; that he was met by General Lejeune; that after his troops had run a part of the distance they boarded a train and then went to the waterworks; that they made a reconnaissance in order to determine where the enemy which had been reported was to be found; and that they could find no enemy.

General Russell testified that there were 500 or 600—and if I do not correctly quote him I shall appreciate it if my friend the chairman of the committee [Mr. TRAMMELL] will correct me. General Russell testified, as I recall, that there had been 500 or 600 Mexicans there; that he had been riding on his horse down the line; that he had been shot at about 20 times. I had always thought the Mexicans had very good aim. I find no reference to that fact in General Lejeune's reminiscences. I do find in his reminiscences at pages 213 and 214 a report of this occurrence. I do find that he states that he and Major Butler climbed a hill and carefully searched the countryside with their binoculars but failed to discover any sign of a force of any description.

Mr. LOGAN. Mr. President—

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

Mr. BLACK. I yield.

Mr. LOGAN. If the Senator is going to deny an officer promotion because he got fooled, what would have happened in the War between the States if the United States Government had followed that plan and demoted or refused to promote every officer of the Union Army who was deceived by Stonewall Jackson, J. E. B. Stuart, John Morgan, General Forrest, and many other distinguished Confederate officers who consistently, for almost 3 long years, fooled the Union Armies and the Union officers nearly all the time?

Mr. BLACK. So far as I recall—I may be wrong, and the Senator may correct me—I do not recall that any of those officers who were fooled testified later under oath that instead of being fooled they were riding down the line and were shot at by the enemy. I do not recall that. Perhaps they did; but I do not think Stonewall Jackson ever did that, if he was fooled. I have not heard that any of the Union officers did that, if they were deceived.

Mr. LOGAN. I think there was one who claimed that his clothes were nearly all shot off him and that he was entirely surrounded when J. E. B. Stuart had a little handful of cavalry and routed the whole Union Army of twenty-five or thirty thousand men.

Mr. BLACK. That being true, I should say, from my experience and observation of general military affairs, that he certainly would not have ranked as a military leader with Robert E. Lee, or with Stonewall Jackson, or even with some of the other officers the Senator may have in mind.

Mr. LOGAN. If the Senator will yield for one more question I shall not interrupt him further, because I am very much interested in his argument.

Mr. BLACK. I shall be delighted to yield.

Mr. LOGAN. Is not the chief complaint of Gen. Smedley Butler that he had to get up on Sunday morning, and before he could get dressed he had to run down there in response to a message that there was a Mexican Army present? He is not complaining that the army was not there when he got there; is he?

Mr. BLACK. Yes.

Mr. LOGAN. I thought he was complaining because he had to go before he got his clothes on.

Mr. BLACK. There was no army there. The Senator is mistaken. The officer he mentions, Gen. Smedley Butler—who has had Congressional Medals of Honor and who has had various other medals for distinguished courage and distinguished bravery, going all the way back to the time he was a lieutenant in China—was not complaining because he had to go; but he was complaining because, soldier that he was, he did object to having a battalion go racing off at double-time on the theory that there was an enemy present, when, according to the evidence, there was no enemy there.

I was reading from the statement of General Lejeune:

Patrols were sent out in various directions, but with the same futile result.

We learned, after conferring with Maj. J. H. Russell and the other officers of the garrison, that the broadcast message was sent because of the fact that a Mexican soldier, bearing a flag of truce, had come to an outpost position with a note from his commanding officer which demanded the surrender of the waterworks, and which further stated that unless his demand was complied with he would attack with his force of about 1,000 men at the end of 10 minutes. The demand had been refused and dispositions made to meet the attack, but it had not been forthcoming.

The threatened attack on El Tejar remained one of the insoluble mysteries, as no definite information concerning it could be obtained, but it is my belief that it was a piece of bravado on the part of an officer in command of a small mounted detachment which had approached to the vicinity of El Tejar through a nearby woods which screened his detachment from view, not only during its approach but during its withdrawal as well.

Mr. President, something has been said about that occurrence having been referred to as the "Battle of Russell's Run" in connection with the idea that it was considered a joke. Is it believed that if the man in command of those troops had been fired at 20 times by a Mexican or by a troop of Mexicans on that occasion, this great soldier, General Lejeune, in writing up his memoirs, would ever have referred to it as "one of the insoluble mysteries", and failed to remark upon the miraculous escape of the officer who was going down the line on his horse?

It was referred to as a joke. It has been referred to as a joke. I state that on the authority of no less a person than Gen. John A. Lejeune in a letter written to me, dated March 1. It took a long time for me to get an answer from General Lejeune. That is perfectly all right. He is a great soldier and a good man. He did not refer to this incident in Mexico in his reply to the Senator from Florida [Mr. TRAMMELL]. When he did not, I wrote him a letter and asked him about that and several other incidents. He did not reply to the inquiry about that incident in his reply to my first letter. I then sent him a telegram last week, asking that he reply. On Friday I received a message that his letter was being prepared and would be sent. It was received yesterday about 12 o'clock, as I recall.

Mr. TRAMMELL. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to interrupt him?

Mr. BLACK. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. TRAMMELL. The telegram which I sent to General Lejeune made no reference at all to particular incidents.

Mr. BLACK. I did not mean to leave that impression.

Mr. TRAMMELL. We hoped to have him come before the committee in person—

Mr. BLACK. That is correct.

Mr. TRAMMELL. But on account of his illness he could not come. The telegram, however, made no reference at all to any particular matter. It merely made inquiry about General Russell in a general way, and also about the promotion system.

Mr. BLACK. This great soldier in this letter has done everything in the world he could to protect the Marine Corps. For that I ascribe no improper motives to him. I think it is absolutely proper that a man who has served in that corps over a long number of years, and who has a pride in it, should adopt exactly the course he has adopted. He was reluctant to write about this incident; and when he finally did so he did it in a very artistic manner, but not in such a way as to conceal the real facts as he had published them in his book. I will read from the letter:

In the second place, as to the El Tejar, Mexico, incident, my memory of its main features is clear in spite of the exciting events of the World War, which commenced a short time after the El Tejar occurrence. I had been superseded as brigadier commander in Veracruz, Mexico, by my senior, Colonel Mahoney, when a chartered steamer brought another regiment of marines, Colonel Mahoney, and some other officers from the States to Veracruz. Upon his request I remained on duty at brigade headquarters for 2 days as Chief of Staff.

The morning of the El Tejar incident I had requested and received my orders to resume command of the Second Regiment and was garbing myself with the usual military paraphernalia—haversack, dispatch case, pistol, field glasses, and ammunition—preparatory to going to Second Regiment headquarters when I heard the conversation over the telephone referring to a wireless message

from El Tejar, the telephone wire to that place having been cut that morning. Located about 9 miles from Veracruz, El Tejar and the waterworks were guarded by three companies of marines under command of Major Russell. To be brief, I was told that the above-mentioned wireless message reported a probable attack on the waterworks by a large force of Mexican soldiers, and that three battalions of marines were being dispatched as reinforcements. I asked and received permission to go in command of the marines, mounted my horse, and rode toward Second Regiment headquarters. I joined Major Butler as his battalion took the road to El Tejar. When we were well out of town a train of freight cars loaded with an Army regiment stopped, and the marines climbed aboard.

When we arrived at El Tejar quiet reigned, and Major Butler and I reconnoitered on foot the surrounding terrain as best we could from a hilltop, where we could get a good view of the open country, but everything was quiet and no hostile troops were in sight. It seems that that morning a note was brought in to the officer in charge of a small detachment on outpost duty. The note was to the effect that a Mexican force of over 1,000 men in that vicinity would surround—

Would surround—

and attack and capture El Tejar if the marines did not surrender within 10 minutes' time. There was a large clump of woods located near El Tejar which was supposed to conceal the Mexican force. Major Butler and I spent the night at Major Russell's headquarters, and Major Russell and I made a thorough reconnaissance on horseback that afternoon of the surrounding country, when we selected locations for the day and night posts of the outpost detachments, and defensive positions to occupy if the waterworks were attacked. So much for the El Tejar incident.

According to my recollection of the El Tejar incident, we considered it a joke, and we were fond of "joshing" the officers who were there at the time about the famous battle of El Tejar!

After this statement by this eminent soldier, who has won his spurs on the battlefield, who will assert again that there was anything serious in the so-called "Battle of El Tejar"? When a man is up for confirmation for next to the highest military position which this Government can give, will anyone state to me that there is anything improper in bringing before this body the facts with reference to an incident—facts which speak so strongly that no one needs an interpreter to determine the reason for the existence of those facts?

I have here a letter from a private who was there at the time. He has not been passed over by any board, nor has he been selected by any board. A reference was made to a trumpeter or bugler who went up to find the Mexicans. This letter, dated March 2, 1935, is from that gentleman. It is addressed to Maj. Gen. Smedley D. Butler:

MY DEAR GENERAL: Reading an editorial by the Associated Press, I cannot but help writing to you to congratulate you on your courage to disclose the incident that occurred at the waterworks at El Tejar, 9 miles from Veracruz, in 1914. I was the bugler that sounded the call to arms and the first to go to the front where the said called "rebels" were. I take an oath in saying that we did not find a single rebel that was supposed to attack us.

Once a marine, always a marine! My hat goes off again for your courage in defense of the good old corps.

I am, very sincerely yours,

JAMES M. VOTTA.

There is on the way to me at the present time through the mail another letter from another private, who was present at the time and who read of this occurrence and immediately communicated his views of what happened.

Mr. President, I desire to call attention to the fact that it has been wholly and completely impossible up to date to get from the Marine Corps a single report of who was in command at El Tejar. I have not been able to obtain the diaries of the officers who were there. There has been sent to us a part of the diary of General Funston, who was not there, who was away from there; but we all know that there must appear somewhere a record of whether or not General Russell was actually relieved from duty, and whether or not Captain Long was put in his place. That record has not come to us.

All Senators who served in the Army know that there were kept not only regimental records and brigade records, but there were battalion records, there were company records, there were certainly command records, as to what was happening at El Tejar; and from no source, other than the sworn statement of General Russell given before the Committee on Naval Affairs in connection with his nomination, from no source under the sun, has there been a single

vestige of evidence that 20 shots were fired at General Russell at that time, as he went down the road on horseback.

A letter was read to me this morning over the telephone, a letter which came from the private I have just mentioned and which is on its way, and he states in that letter that General Russell stayed in his house from the previous afternoon, when it was first mentioned that there might be rebels, and never left that house until after the occurrence about which testimony has been given.

Mr. President, I do not know what the facts are. I do know that the testimony given by General Butler is substantiated by the book of General Lejeune. I do know that what has been said about what is referred to as the "Battle of Russells Run" is certainly substantiated by the statement of General Lejeune written 3 days ago—that it had always been considered a joke and they had been joshing the officers about the famous Battle of El Tejar.

Do Senators think they would have been joshing an officer about a battle—I just ask; I do not know—do Senators think it would have gone down in history as one of the "insoluble" mysteries, and that it would have gone down as a standing joke in the Marine Corps, if the man in charge had been fired at 20 times as he rode boldly to the top of the hill in the face of the enemy?

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

Mr. BLACK. I yield.

Mr. DUFFY. I take it that the Senator's chief complaint is not so much that the general was fooled by the Mexicans making him believe there was a big force out in the woods, but that he appeared before the committee and swore falsely as to the matter, in the opinion of the Senator.

Mr. BLACK. I shall not make a statement that any witness swears falsely. I will state that I intend to call attention in a few moments to testimony given by General Russell before the Committee on Naval Affairs under oath, where he first said that he did not know anything about a bulletin, and later gave all the reasons why he issued the bulletin, and, after he left the committee, sent a letter here and said he had nothing to do with it. I shall read that from the record.

I call attention to the fact that when General Russell gave part of his testimony to the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], the Senator from Massachusetts suggested that it was necessary that he be frank with the committee and not attempt to evade the issues or the questions.

Since we have come to that point, let me refer to the testimony. I would not think that any Senator who simply read the evidence, without being familiar with it, would have caught what happened; but if Senators have the report of the evidence before them, I ask them to take their record and turn to pages 42, 43, 44, and 45, and first to page 42.

In order to give the background, before Senators read the testimony, I call attention to the fact that many officers of the Marine Corps are exceedingly disturbed because they find themselves in the power of a group which they believe is hostile to them. They find they can be taken out and have their military heads cut off at any minute—just as General MacArthur testified before the Committee on Military Affairs a few weeks ago could be done—under that system, the evidence as to which I shall read to the Senate presently. Therefore, some of the officers, after this happened, were busy attempting to defeat the legislation which would permit them to be kicked bodily out of the Marine Corps.

A bulletin was sent out on February 9, and a copy of the bulletin was sent to me from a number of different officers. It was issued on February 9, 1935, after the hearings on the Russell nomination began, only a few days before General Russell appeared before the committee. Let us see what he said when I first showed him the bulletin, as appears on page 42, in the first questions I asked him:

General Russell, may I ask you if you wrote that [indicating], or prepared that bulletin, or know anything about it?

General RUSSELL. This bulletin?

Senator BLACK. To the officers of the Naval and Marine Corps?

General RUSSELL. When was this, in 1935? I do not know whether I did or not. I probably did.

Note that:

I do not know whether I did or not. I probably did.

Then I asked him if he was familiar with the fact that there had been an effort made on the part of certain officers in connection with this selection legislation. Then the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] and some of the other members of the committee asked that the bulletin be read. The date was given as February 9, 1935. Listen to this. I read from page 43:

Senator WALSH. Have you any doubt as to whether you wrote that?

General RUSSELL. I stand for it absolutely.

Senator WALSH. As recent as that?

General RUSSELL. I stand for it.

Note that he stood for it at that time. At first he said, "I do not know whether I did or not." The second time he said, "I stand for it." Note, on page 43, the same page, at the bottom, the following:

Senator BLACK. General Russell, the question I want to find out is what prompted you to send out that particular bulletin at this particular time?

General RUSSELL. What prompted me to send it out?

Senator BLACK. Yes, sir.

General RUSSELL. I understood—

This is the same gentleman who did not know whether he wrote it or not—

I understood that officers were organizing to prevent the passage of the repeal of section 16—

It was printed "18" but it is "16"—

which the Navy Department, the Secretary of the Navy, has approved and sent to the Speaker of the House and to the Vice President, and it has been referred to the Naval Committees.

Let us go a little further, down near the middle of the page:

General RUSSELL. Yes, sir. It was sent out from the Quantico post.

Senator WALSH. Under the name of the officer there?

General RUSSELL. Yes, sir.

Senator WALSH. But you sent it out to begin with?

General RUSSELL. Yes, sir.

Senator WALSH. I would like to have the stenographer turn back to the first question Senator BLACK asked the general, and get the general's answer. Will you read that to us, please?

The reporter turned back and read this:

Senator BLACK. May I ask if you wrote that [indicating] or prepared that bulletin, or know anything about it?

General RUSSELL. This bulletin?

Senator BLACK. To the officers of the Naval and Marine Corps.

General RUSSELL. When was this, in 1935? I do not know whether I did or not. I probably did.

Note that he had just answered Senator WALSH that he sent it out to begin with, and the Senator from Massachusetts had the reporter read back to see what he had previously said.

I read further now from the recent hearings before the committee, following what I have just read:

General RUSSELL. I suppose I did now.

Senator WALSH. General, that is not the way to treat a committee. You did or you did not.

General RUSSELL. I will tell you why I was misled, Senator. When I looked down and saw it here it looked like a post order at first.

In other words, he is saying now that he was misled at first about who did it, and he is explaining why he said at first he did not know.

Senator BLACK. You read it all, didn't you, General, before you answered that question?

General RUSSELL. No; I did not. It looked like a post order signed by the adjutant.

Senator WALSH. We are not unfriendly. We want frankness here, General.

Let me ask Senators to turn now to the second little volume of evidence, page 1, remembering that he first said he did not know, when asked who wrote the bulletin of February 9, his appearance before the committee, I believe, being on February 12. Am I correct in that, that his appearance before the committee was on February 12?

Mr. TRAMMELL. Yes.

Mr. BLACK. The bulletin had been sent out on February 9, 3 days previously. First he said he did not know. Later he said he sent it out. Now, let us see what he said on February 14:

MY DEAR SENATOR TRAMMELL: Referring to my testimony before the Senate Naval Affairs Committee on February 12, 1935, the record shows that Senator BLACK handed me a mimeographed copy of a Quantico post order and asked me if I was responsible for it.

I did not ask him that.

Mr. GERRY. On what page is that?

Mr. BLACK. Beginning at the bottom of page 1 and going on to page 2. I resume reading the letter:

I assumed all responsibility, as I knew full well the Navy regulations on the subject and had discussed with officers the advisability of issuing such an order.

However, I found on looking into the matter on my return to the Navy Department that the order was not issued by me, but by the Secretary of the Navy as an entirely independent action without suggestion from me or anyone connected with headquarters or the Marine Corps.

At the same time he testified that he was in favor of and backing the bill which these officers were trying to defeat. And even in this last letter, where he retreats from the position he took before the committee under oath, he says he knew that he had been discussing the advisability of this order with other people. Why is it necessary to try to get out from the responsibility of issuing this order? I will tell the Senate one of the reasons. Some Senators may know it from those who have come to see them about this case.

Immediately after asking about that bulletin, when the officers were told they should keep their mouths shut and not come before this committee, I asked General Russell whether any efforts had been made to influence Senators in regard to his confirmation. It so happened that a few days before, the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] had been present in the committee and had asked some questions which indicated that he wanted to get at the truth of this situation, and was not willing simply to accept a statement because it came from a department. Senator SMITH's questions had clearly so indicated. If Senators will look at the hearings they will find that first General Russell said that some officers had discussed it to his knowledge. I asked him, as appears on page 46, in the middle of the page:

Do you know of any such thing that has been done?

That is, asking that telegrams and messages be sent to Senators.

General RUSSELL. I have had officers come to me and say they have done that.

Senator BLACK. What officers?

Plural.

General RUSSELL. Officers; I think that one of them is Major Arthur, right over there [indicating].

Senator BLACK. Major Arthur?

General RUSSELL. Sitting over there in the corner; yes.

Senator BLACK. What position does he hold?

General RUSSELL. He is in the adjutant inspector's office.

That is the position to which the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] referred yesterday—the adjutant inspector's office.

Senator BLACK. He is in the adjutant inspector's office. Who is his superior?

General RUSSELL. General Porter.

Senator BLACK. Was he on the board?

General RUSSELL. General Porter was on the board.

Senator BLACK. What other officers—

Remember that he said "officers"—

What other officers have you had tell you they have either written or requested, directly or indirectly, their people in the various States to write or appeal to their Senators with reference to your confirmation?

General RUSSELL. He is the only one that I recall.

And later on Major Arthur testified he was there and heard Senator SMITH testify, and that they called up South Carolina and attempted to get the man who had been the head of the American Legion of that State to contact Senator SMITH in regard to this matter. But, remember, the bulletin that had been published and gone out had sealed the

lips of the officers. It prevented their attempting to defeat the legislation which will cut off their military careers and send them out of the service, even though they wear decorations of American service in the form of bullets and the ravages of disease.

Mr. President, I now want to call attention to the fact that that was not all. Senators will find here a statement by General Russell that he discussed some matters with General Holcomb either the day before or 2 or 3 days before he came before the committee, which was after his first appearance. That was after the testimony had been given that General Lejeune was present at El Tejar. My good friend from Florida [Mr. TRAMMELL] stated that General Lejeune gave a voluntary statement to the committee which the Senator believed to be true. As a matter of fact, if they will summon General Holcomb and Colonel Keyser before the committee, two men who served in France with General Lejeune, they will find that General Holcomb, the man who was in conference with General Russell, and Colonel Keyser, were in conference with General Lejeune with reference to his letter. They will find that before General Lejeune ever sent that letter to the committee he had a direct, positive statement from General Holcomb by telegram explaining to him that he believed the action of the board was all right, and they were calling on him to come to the rescue of the Marine Corps in connection with his evidence and his letter, as he had been called upon during the trying period of the World War.

If there is any question about that, Senators can either summon General Holcomb, who was the head of the junior board and who was promoted to be general, or they can summon Colonel Keyser, or I can show them the copy of the telegram which I have on my desk.

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

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

Mr. TYDINGS. Without taking issue with what the Senator from Alabama has said as to the facts, may I say that my own estimate of General Lejeune is that he would not write any article he did not believe was honest and true.

Mr. BLACK. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. TYDINGS. And if General Lejeune wrote it he would have written it anyway, whether or not there had been any conference such as the Senator stated.

Mr. BLACK. I may state to the Senator that I make the point that General Lejeune was down in Lexington; he was not familiar with the promotions; he had not kept up with them. He had recently suffered an accident. Before they could get any O. K. from him they had to give him a statement from a man whom he trusted. General Holcomb had served with him in France; Colonel Keyser had served with him.

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

Mr. BLACK. I yield.

Mr. GERRY. Is it not true that the general endorsed the provision for a board, and he was in favor of the selection board, so as to get away from the "hump", according to the testimony that was presented yesterday?

Mr. BLACK. There is no question that he was in favor of a selection board. That is correct.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. BLACK. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. At the time General Lejeune was Commandant of the Marine Corps I became very active in connection with a bill which General Lejeune brought here to take the "hump" out of the Marine Corps, and I made some remarks in the Senate on the occasion. The set-up now in effect is substantially the set-up which General Lejeune advocated at that time. It may have been changed in some particulars, but General Lejeune favored it in the way it was then presented.

Further than that, in General Lejeune's letter, which embraced, I think, three pages, and which I have read, he goes out of his way to show that in this kind of a set-up any officer who is on the selection board must have opprobrium

heaped upon him by those who fail of promotion because the number to be promoted, particularly when it was first applied, was far in excess of those to be hereafter promoted, due to the "hump", and, therefore, hereafter any officer who will be displaced will feel he has been dealt with unfairly, and it will likewise bring on criticism at this time in an unusual degree.

Mr. GERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. BLACK. I yield.

Mr. GERRY. I will say in connection with what the Senator from Maryland has said that I was on the House Naval Committee in 1913, at which time criticism was being indulged of the "plucking" board, which afterward became the selection board, and from my experience I know that every time we try to remove a "hump" Members of Congress, both in the House and the Senate, will be importuned because some injustice has been done; and I do not see very well how anything else can be done than to leave the matter to the Navy Department if the officers who are authorized to speak are in favor of the legislation, as General Lejeune is. Of course, there is opposition when men are not promoted.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. BLACK. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I must apologize because yesterday I was not able to hear the remarks of the Senator, and this morning I have been in the Appropriations Committee ever since it began its meeting and have just now come on the floor. Is it the Senator's contention that the board lately convened to select officers for promotion in the Marine Corps did not act fairly?

Mr. BLACK. Absolutely.

Mr. TYDINGS. Has the Senator explained in what regard they have not acted fairly?

Mr. BLACK. I am proceeding now to do so.

Mr. TYDINGS. If the Senator has done so, I will read it in the RECORD. If he has not, I should like to hear it.

Mr. BLACK. I have not completed it as yet. The statement was made about the removal of the "hump", and that it could not be done without causing trouble. It can be done. The first bill that came up in the Military Affairs Committee when I came to the United States Senate was a bill to remove the "hump" by "plucking" World War officers. It was recommended by the War Department. After some months I succeeded in defeating that bill in the committee and reporting a substitute measure to the Senate, which provided a just method for removal of the "hump." The War Department opposed it. It was defeated. The "hump" continued, but at the present time there is pending on the calendar a bill which I hope will be passed the next time the Senate calendar shall be called—a bill proposed by General MacArthur to remove the "hump" in the Army without the iniquitous system of a "plucking" board to be administered unfairly and unjustly to men who served in the World War. I recommend the study of that bill to those who are interested in the proper method of determining how to remove the "hump."

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, may I say to the Senator from Alabama that, as I recall the system as it existed in the Marine Corps, the "hump" was more aggravated than that which existed in the Army or the Navy. It was shown by General Lejeune that men who became second lieutenants at an early age under the system then in vogue would retire as captains, and, therefore, in order to permit men to reach some degree of rank before they were retired it was necessary to apply a more drastic remedy to the Marine Corps than that which had to be applied to the Army and Navy. Therefore, the percentage of officers affected is much larger in the Marine Corps than in the Army or Navy.

Mr. BLACK. I may state to the Senator that I do not propose at this time to enter upon a complete discussion of that feature, but there are men who served in the World War who went in as second lieutenants and who, without some kind of a measure to relieve the "hump", would retire as first lieutenants.

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

Mr. BLACK. I yield.

Mr. GERRY. As I read the testimony, General Butler brought up that question in the hearings; but the answer is that, while a man might have a brilliant record as a second lieutenant, and be a man of great bravery, it would not necessarily follow that he was qualified to become one of the high-ranking officers in the Marine Corps, where other qualities such as judgment, and so forth, are necessary.

Mr. BLACK. I agree with that statement fully, but I further agree that a board in Washington, practically all the members of which are serving in capacities connected with a revolving chair—and I will show in a few minutes how some of them are serving—cannot pass on a man and tell whether he can meet an emergency when he gets on the battlefield. I agree thoroughly with General MacArthur, whose statement was made on February 9 before the Military Affairs Committee, when he said:

Moreover, in time of peace the measure of capacity of an officer, the yardstick by which you measure his capacity is not of such scope as to really define the officer's combatability. Some of the most astonishing reverses have been found under actual field conditions. Officers who everybody thought were of extraordinary merit, under the tremendous pressure of nervous strain, of the physical contacts—the blood, the disaster of the battlefield—have collapsed; whereas those men who in time of peace would apparently have a much lower general efficiency rating have exhibited traits of character which have brought them to the front at once. They were able to register all their ability under an emergency, whereas the former—the predicted brilliant officer—

I might say one who would be "predicted" down in the marine headquarters in days of "piping peace"; but, as General Butler suggested, he did not think they ought to have a knitting party and that often "the predicted brilliant officer" was not able to register more than a fraction of his ability.

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

Mr. BLACK. I yield.

Mr. GERRY. According to the Senator's argument, then, he is not willing to trust the opinion of General Lejeune, who recommended this board and who is one of the greatest fighting officers the Marine Corps has ever had? I am going on his opinion and the opinion of other officers such as he.

Mr. BLACK. I am not going on the opinion of General Lejeune with reference to the board which sat in Washington, which was headed by a man who had formerly sat at the head of another board and had demoted some of the same officers who had won their spurs on the battlefields of France. It became necessary to enact legislation in order to undo the action of General Russell's board.

In 1919 General Russell was the head of a board, the only other board of which he was ever at the head, and the question arose as to what would be done with certain men who had served in the Army. He says in his evidence, it will be found, that the question was what would be done with the noncommissioned officers who had served brilliantly and who had received commissions. His board acted, and such a clamor went up from all over this Nation by people who knew the injustices that had been done to the men who had served on the battlefield of France that Congress itself, by an amendment proposed in this very body, authorized a new board, and General Lejeune set up that board. That new board was created upon the recommendation of the same General Lejeune, and when it met it proceeded to overturn the action of the Russell board.

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

Mr. BLACK. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. LONG. As I understand, General Lejeune set up a board to undo what Russell had done?

Mr. BLACK. That is correct. It was done upon his recommendation to Congress with reference to the establishment of a new board. What happened? Some of these men were saved then; and if one will look at General Russell's evidence he will find that he still says the original mistake was made in this new board which was set up to undo the plain, palpable injustice which had been perpetrated upon

men who served at the battle front. They changed it then, and things went along peacefully and quietly in the Marine Corps. Until General Russell again became Commandant no effort had been made to take away the places that had been won by men in actual service before the enemy.

Mr. GERRY. Mr. President, is it not true, if the Senator will yield to me, that there is a "hump" at the present time because there has been no selection board in the Marine Corps?

Mr. BLACK. If there is a "hump", I want the situation growing out of that "hump" handled in a humane way and not unjustly by a man who attempted to do it unjustly before the Congress corrected the abuses.

Mr. TYDINGS. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BLACK. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to point out to the Senator that human nature is so strong that any method devised to relieve that "hump" which eventuates in eliminating men will cause much dissatisfaction, and that there is no perfect system which can be set up to eliminate officers from the Army, the Navy, or the Marine Corps.

Mr. BLACK. I call the Senator's attention again to the fact that they had the "hump" in the Army, and they tried to put over the same kind of an iniquitous system, but some of us on the Military Affairs Committee defeated it.

Mr. TYDINGS. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BLACK. I will yield when I finish. We defeated it then, and the Army never proposed it again. The men who proposed that system are not in control; and now General MacArthur comes before the Senate and offers a bill which will relieve the "hump" in a humane and fair way. I heard that this was to be done, and I assumed that probably the War Department might be again going to try to follow the old method which had been proposed. So I wrote General MacArthur and told him I wanted to see just what they were going to do. He brought me the bill. I went over it; the Senate committee went over it and unanimously reported it. It is believed that it will afford a fair, just, and humane method of relieving the "hump" in the Army. It will not work to the detriment of men who served in France, and perhaps will not cause the Senate to keep on talking about a "hump." A "hump"! Which is the more important—a "hump" or justice to men who fought the war at the time when, as it was stated, we fought "to make the world safe for democracy?"

I claim that an investigation of this matter will show that a rank, outrageous injustice has been done to men who served on the battle front; and it will not be done so long as I can prevent it and so long as I am able to raise my voice against it.

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

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

Mr. TYDINGS. At the time the Marine Corps promotion bill was pending, General Lejeune, who was then Commandant of the Marine Corps, came to the Senate and appeared before the Naval Affairs Committee. He compared the size of the "hump" in the Army and the Navy with that in the Marine Corps. As I have said, I interested myself in the proposal when it came up; and while I have not the exact figures, I am well within the bounds of caution in making the observation that the "hump" in the Marine Corps was more than twice as aggravated as in either the Army or the Navy.

Mr. BLACK. I have no mathematical calculations of the height of the "hump"; but, in my judgment, a rank, outrageous injustice is about to be perpetrated upon men who fought on the battle front. Let men say what they will about General Butler, no one can deny that his record shows a splendid series of brave and courageous acts on the battle front. No one can deny that his record shows that when the effort was made to do an injustice to the men who he knew had served valiantly and well on the battle front his voice was then raised. Then it was that General Lejeune joined him and a new board was created to do justice to the men who had been improperly treated by General Russell's board. They did it then.

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

Mr. BLACK. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. GERRY. Is it not true, though, that the Marine Corps has not had a selection board, such as the Navy has had, with a result that has been detrimental to the Marine Corps, because, as in the Navy before the creation of selection boards, they were unable to eliminate officers who should not rise to the higher grades? There can be no question that no one wants to do any injustice to any officer. The main point is to promote efficiency in the corps so that they may best perform their duties. It may well be doubted whether Congress can really have the knowledge that officers of the Marine Corps, such as General Lejeune, possess as to the fitness of these officers. Of course, as soon as any officer is "plucked" it is always an injustice to that officer in his own estimation.

Mr. BLACK. I would be very much pleased if a new board could be created and General Lejeune put on it. I will guarantee if they had men of the type of General Lejeune and Gen. Harry Lee that we would never have any such thing as occurred with reference to the selection board. I am not sure that that can be done; I am not sure but that General MacArthur was right in this further statement:

General MACARTHUR. The retirement of competent officers creates a psychology of fear, of intimidation, throughout the whole officer personnel. Every year they would have to go through the purging process, if I can use so drastic a term, and it would make even the most excellent officers timid.

Of course it would; it always creates a reign of terror; it always creates a boot-licking class, a group who find that the only way in the world to get anything is to clean the boots of somebody who has political prestige or power. That is what General MacArthur is talking about.

Senator CAREY. They fear that they will be the next?

General MACARTHUR. They would be fearful. There are no human agencies that are infallible in methods of selection. This makes the man not only timid but it tends to make him cater to the views and wishes of senior officers—

Boot licking—

even if he does not honestly believe in those views.

We believe, from every standpoint, that it is not desirable and we would not advocate such a process in the American Army.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President—

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

Mr. BLACK. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator realizes that there are very few promotions in the Marine Corps, because it is a very small organization?

Mr. BLACK. That is correct.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator suggests doing away with the selection board and that seniority should apply. The Senator will be fair enough to concede that under that system quite often the few high offices which direct the whole corps might be manned not by the best officers but by the senior officers. Will the Senator concede that to be so?

Mr. BLACK. I will concede it is possible that the senior officers might not always be the men who had all the best possible qualities. Let me add to that statement. I will also concede that it might be possible that in the case of a board made up of General Russell and those whom he appoints here in Washington, who are serving under him and most of whom have been recommended for promotion by him, there might be a slight possibility of error creeping in.

Mr. TYDINGS. I rose to point out that even under the system which the Senator inferentially advocates, he admits the plan would not work efficiently; that officers would only have to be in the Marine Corps the greatest length of time in order eventually to command it. General MacArthur, the advocate whom the Senator uses to prove his point, is an example of the system against which the Senator inveighs. General MacArthur is a junior in the Army. He was appointed over the heads of many major generals, yet the Senator uses the exponent of the system which he decries to prove the opposite case.

Mr. BLACK. The Senator is not going to get me away from the real issue before us.

Mr. TYDINGS. But the Senator did get away from it.

Mr. BLACK. The real issue is that a board has been created manifestly for the purpose of undoing what the board did in 1920. It is the first time General Russell had the opportunity, and he availed himself of the opportunity. He admits in his evidence that it was wrong, and he said it needed correction.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President—

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

Mr. BLACK. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not desire to interrupt the Senator constantly.

Mr. BLACK. Is the Senator from Maryland a member of the Naval Affairs Committee?

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes; the Senator from Maryland is a member of that committee. May I say to the Senator from Alabama that we have to have one or the other of the two systems? We have either to have a seniority system on the one hand, or a selection board on the other hand. Under the Senator's proposed system, at least the one he advocates inferentially, it would not be possible to get such experienced and able men at the head of the Army as General MacArthur. We could not get a man like that under the Senator's system. I do not care what system we set up, it is not going to please every officer in the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps. My observation is that we get better officers under the selective system than under the seniority system.

Mr. GERRY. That is why General Lejeune is advocating this system.

Mr. BLACK. Is it not an issue before the Senate at this time as to whether we favor the selective system or the seniority system.

Mr. TYDINGS. I appreciate that is so. If the Senator will permit me to interrupt further, if we are not going to debate that point, then General Russell simply carried out the system which is now in effect. The Senator's criticism is not of the system, but of the way it was carried out. The Senator has been arguing for half an hour that under the system men who served on the battle front were relegated to the rear, and that was the basis of my interruption.

Mr. BLACK. The Senator is in error in his assumption. I believe a fair implication of the selective system would not have brought about the results which have been brought about here.

I recognize the apparent impossibility of doing anything against a proposal made by the Navy or the Army. I have been a member of the Committee on Military Affairs ever since I came to the Senate. I realize that sometimes good friends who sit on those committees finally reach a point where if one dares to question the dotting of an "i" or the crossing of a "t" as suggested by the military or naval authorities, he is simply committing a sacrilege.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President—

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

Mr. BLACK. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I want to say, so far as my knowledge of General Russell goes, it is personal. I happened to be in Haiti when they were head-hunting down there and a good many bandits were holding up everybody who used the roads outside of the town. I saw the work that had been done there. My comment, and it is made as an American citizen, is that General Russell did a splendid job and nobody would say that with more enthusiasm than the people of Haiti themselves, who with a great deal of reluctance saw the marines leave, although they did not want them in the country because of national pride, yet at the same time were frank enough to express themselves in that way.

Mr. BLACK. It may be proper to express a personal opinion about a visit to Haiti. I have not done so although I formed an opinion, and my opinion was somewhat in line with the opinion expressed by the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY].

I may state to the Senator from Maryland that an American citizen desired to talk to me about the situation in Haiti and he did not dare to discuss it with me in the city of Port au Prince. He did not dare to open his mouth there. There was an absolute reign of terror which prevented it, and so, at his request, I talked to him about 4 miles outside of the city of Port au Prince in order that he might tell me the situation which actually existed in that beautiful city which the Senator portrays. I admit the Americans may have built some roads, but what do the Haitians need with all those roads? They were poor people who had had a law for 100 years that no foreigner should own any land in that country, and then had their constitution amended at the point of the bayonet and an election supervised by the marines, with drawn swords, in order to determine that they should have a constitution which would enable them to sell their lands to foreigners.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President—

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

Mr. BLACK. Certainly.

Mr. TYDINGS. May I point out to the Senator that at the time the marines were landed in Port au Prince the President of the country had been cornered in his house, had been brought out, had his legs cut off, had his head cut off, had his arms cut off, and was being dragged through the streets by a mob; that warships of foreign countries, principally countries of Europe, came into the harbor and were about to land troops, and if it had not been for the landing of American troops we would have had European occupation in the Western Hemisphere. That was the situation which the marines found when they were landed. Because they were landed European soldiers were not landed, as we do not want them landed in the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. BLACK. I do not care to go into the merits of that question, but to those who are interested I suggest they read a book called "Occupied Haiti." I understand the great philanthropic motives which always operate when a conquering nation wants to seize a conquered country. Alexander the Great during his career never conquered a country except to take them a great civilization. He wanted to have roads built. He wanted to improve their condition. When we have sent our marines to Nicaragua and to South America our action has always been accompanied by the great philanthropic motive of carrying civilization to them; but when we finished we found usually, as was the case in Haiti, that the money had been issued by the City National Bank of New York and the customs were collected in order to pay the interest in New York on the money the Haitians had borrowed.

However, I am not going to enter now upon a discussion of that matter. We are discussing now the question of the promotion system. It is very natural, it is exceedingly natural, that we should attempt to confuse the issue, which is whether or not we are going to stand for the action of promotion boards which have rendered absolute injustice to marine officers in this country.

Now let us see who served on the boards.

The senior board in 1934 selected 69 and passed over 78. I am wondering if it is true that the marine personnel in this country has gotten down to such a point that there are 78 of them who ought to be kicked out of the service. If so, one of two things is wrong: Something is wrong with the selection board, or something has been wrong in the past which has permitted them to stay on the roll.

Let us see who served on the boards. Let us take the second one:

General Russell, the Commandant of the Marine Corps, with the power of life and death over the other officers by reason of his place. He can move them where he pleases. He can send them wherever he desires. He can remove them from a favored spot and send them to an undesirable spot.

Who is the next one? General McDougal. Who is General McDougal? His Assistant Commandant, sitting here in Washington. Promoted? Yes. Any other obligations?

Yes. If Senators desire to know what the other obligations were, read the record.

General Porter—where was General Porter? Adjutant and inspector, I believe, here in Washington.

General Little, working at headquarters.

General Berkeley was not working at headquarters.

General Williams—where was he? Here in Washington. What happened to him? He was promoted. By whose board? General Russell's board. General Russell was the head of the Marine Corps.

How many of them served in France? General McDougal arrived in September and stayed until November 14. General Williams went over there in September and stayed until November.

Let us see about the other board. The board I have mentioned was the second board. The first board was composed of General Russell; General Lee—a man with distinguished service—there is no question about that. It would be very interesting, in my judgment, if the committee would summon General Lee and find out what he thinks about this matter. I have not seen him. I have not talked with him. I have never talked with him, but I had hoped he would be summoned. The other members were General Breckenridge, with no war service; General Lyman, with no war service; General Lane, with no war service; General McDougal, again, with service from September to November, serving directly under General Russell here in Washington. One officer came all the way from California, but he did not serve. They said it was found that he would have to stay here too long. He is an officer who is serving now in California.

So, Mr. President, we find the board made up, with the Commandant of the Marine Corps at the head of it. It is true that he states he did not know how the other members were going to vote. He also swore that he never discussed with them the promotion of a single individual. Think of that! A board that is going to meet, and they take the records and go over them for a week or 10 days or 2 weeks, and the evidence is that the head of the board never discussed a single one with a single member of the board!

Of course, that may be correct. Ordinarily, we would not anticipate that things were done in that way. What is the evidence? What do we have? We have the Commandant of the Marine Corps, with the life of every officer under him in his control, sitting at the head of the board, and we find a situation where he admits that he thought what had been done in 1920 ought to be undone. We find him sitting there; and then, when we look over the record, and General Smedley Butler looks it over—the man who had served on the first board that corrected the injustices of General Russell—he comes down and swears before the committee that they did exactly what they said they wanted to do.

There is the record, and there is what has been done to these officers.

I do not know what the Senate will do about this nomination. Ordinarily confirmation is a matter of form. Officers are recommended by the Navy Department. Certainly we would not vote against the Navy Department. They are recommended by the War Department. We could not vote against the War Department. Yet we are voting now upon the promotion of the man whose evidence Senators have heard read here, and who contradicted himself in such a way that a member of the committee had read back to him the very evidence which this man had given when it first fell from his lips when he went on the stand.

Mr. President, I shall not go into the details of what has happened to the officers. The evidence shows that over 50 percent of those in certain classes have been passed over. That means, if this whole plan and scheme shall succeed—and I call it a scheme advisedly—and if the Senate and House shall swallow the means by which it is proposed that these men shall be kicked out, they will be removed from the Marine Corps. Their chance to earn their daily bread will be taken away from them. Men who have served as long as 30 years, with not a single blot on their records, will be removed from the corps, and the Senate will approve the promotion of others who have general courts martial

sprinkled through the years. That is what we will do. We can very easily ascertain, by a proper investigation, what has happened.

Why should we object to having this matter go back to the committee in order to determine whether or not this is a blow aimed straight at the heart of the Marine Corps of this Nation? How can we expect to get loyal service from men who have the sword hanging over their heads every minute when they know that the Commandant of the Marine Corps selects his own assistants? That is the evidence. Of course, theoretically, they are appointed by the Secretary of the Navy, but that is only theory. General Russell admitted that they were all recommended by him for appointment, including himself. So we find serving under him the men upon whom we expect to call, perhaps—I hope not—to go and make some other country in South America safe for democracy and the National City Bank, to suffer from amoebic dysentery and fever, as did the officer from whose letter I quoted.

Mr. President, I desire to say about General Williams, who is the one whose name is up now, that I was not the one who originally objected to his confirmation. I stated yesterday afternoon that I did not want the nomination of General Williams passed on at that time because the Senator who objected was not here. While it is my belief that there are other men who, from what I have seen, were over General Williams on the roster, who are capable of serving well if promoted, it is not my intention to wage any fight against General Williams; but I do insist that we should either refuse to confirm General Russell or we should send his nomination back to the committee.

I have not mentioned the incident which happened with reference to the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] because, as is shown by the record, I stated that at his request I was not asking any investigation of that incident by the committee. I was familiar with the fight that had been made by the Senator from Utah—a magnificent fight—for the people who lived in Haiti, in order to try to preserve and protect their rights. He had not succeeded in winning a victory, but on their behalf he waged a fight which, in my judgment, did result in good when the new administration came into power. I stated yesterday that while I had said I should not ask that that incident be taken up, the treatment accorded the Senator from Utah alone would be sufficient for me to base my vote on, if it were necessary.

What I am now asking, however, is that proper consideration be given to the officers who have served their country well, and who can serve it well in the future unless we permit them to be made the targets of a group sitting on the inside in Washington, and to have them disgraced, as well as thrown out of the service, by the methods that have been adopted.

THE WRECKING CREW

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, last night, while I was about to undertake to throw myself into the arms of Morpheus, I thought I heard my name being mentioned over the radio in the next room. I listened for a little while, and, lo and behold, I became convinced that perhaps I was being mentioned in some unimportant connection; so I pricked up my ears and turned on the radio in my own room and listened to the speech which was coming over the ether, and I heard my friend Gen. Hugh Johnson making a speech—General Johnson, the man who ran the N. R. A. down here for some time.

So I pricked up my ears a second time to listen to the general. Among other things he said was that the time had arrived when somebody should inform the American people of the great menace of the two pied pipers of the present day and time; and as one of those pied pipers he named Rev. Father Charles E. Coughlin, of Michigan, and as the other he named myself.

The general, who retired from the Army first and from the N. R. A. next, comes out of the house of Bernard M. Baruch. He is one of the employees—a private employee, a hired hand, so to speak—used by the firm of Bernard M. Baruch, Inc., the motto of which is, "Presidents: You make

'em; we break 'em." [Laughter.] According to the Wall Street magazine of J. P. Morgan & Co.—the American Magazine, which I hold in my hand—according to the House of Morgan and its publication Mr. Baruch has been the confidant and the adviser and the overlord of several Presidents.

He has taken his employee, Mr. Hugh Johnson, and at various times has placed him in certain pivotal positions of use.

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

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. FRAZIER. I should like to suggest the absence of a quorum, if the Senator does not object.

Mr. LONG. I do not object, because I think the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] ought to be here.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Adams	Copeland	Keyes	Radcliffe
Ashurst	Costigan	King	Reynolds
Austin	Couzens	La Follette	Robinson
Bachman	Cutting	Logan	Russell
Bailey	Dickinson	Loung	Schall
Bankhead	Dieterich	Long	Schwellenbach
Barbour	Donahey	McAdoo	Sheppard
Bilbo	Duffy	McCarran	Shipstead
Black	Fletcher	McGill	Smith
Bone	Frazier	McKellar	Steiner
Borah	George	McNary	Thomas, Okla.
Brown	Gerry	Maloney	Thomas, Utah
Bulkeley	Gibson	Minton	Townsend
Bulow	Glass	Moore	Trammell
Burke	Gore	Murphy	Truman
Byrd	Guffey	Murray	Tydings
Byrnes	Hale	Neely	Vandenberg
Capper	Harrison	Norbeck	Van Nuys
Carey	Hastings	Norris	Wagner
Clark	Hatch	Nye	Walsh
Connally	Hayden	O'Mahoney	Wheeler
Coolidge	Johnson	Pope	White

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

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, before the quorum was called I was undertaking to make some answer to Mr. Johnson's speech over the radio last evening, which I now propose to pursue.

Mr. Johnson undertakes to warn the American people of a great menace, a double-barreled menace, in the persons of Rev. Charles E. Coughlin and myself. Mr. Johnson undertakes to tell the people exactly what may be expected. He says that there are 80,000,000 very, very badly abused babies in America, referring to all people, the young and the old, as in the class of babies; and that, with 80,000,000 abused babies being extant, the field is rather promising for Rev. Father Coughlin, of Detroit, and myself; and he warns against us as the two dangerous pied pipers.

This Baruch loaned this Johnson to the United States twice before. He has always ventured to lend his handy-andy tools to whoever is in power, provided he has been allowed to sit on the inside and know what is going on a little bit before anybody else knows when it is going to happen, and in that manner to gather and to garner to himself, as a market rigger and as a market manipulator, what seems to be profitable.

He plays no favorites, does Baruch, with his high lights; he plays no favorites in parties; he plays no favorites in individuals. All that is necessary is for one to be in authority to control important functions of the Government, whereupon Baruch usually volunteers himself, and eventually sees that his proffered services are accepted to manipulate the affairs of the United States.

Right at this time, with the market being rigged and manipulated as has never been done since the World War, he is generally known as the "greatest exporter and importer of metals, of gold and silver." He is generally known as the "greatest buyer and seller of commodities that never touch his hands." He is generally publicized by the journals of the country and by the newspapers of the country as the man who makes big money because he is wise on what the market is going to do.

He knows when the dollar is going to be depreciated or when the dollar is going up, if the high lights know what

the rumors speak. He knows when the pound is going to be one thing or when it is going to be another. He guesses on everything except the weather. He does not guess on those things which are controlled by the hands of nature, only on those things which are controlled by the hands of man, provided he is close to the throne, to the hand of the man who is in charge of those particular manipulations.

He sallies forth with this man Hugh Johnson. He sent Hugh Johnson down here to organize the N. R. A. I made the charge on the floor of the Senate that Mr. Johnson was appointed as an employee of Baruch, and that he would not have been here if Baruch had not sent him here; that Baruch had loaned his man again to the United States.

My statement was challenged. A few moments later I met the general out in the lobby of the Capitol, and he assured me that he took no offense; that he was a Baruch man and an employee of Mr. Baruch, and came here in that capacity, and would go back as soon as he got through filling his itinerant job down here in Washington, D. C. And he did.

He came from Baruch to Wilson, and went from Wilson back to Baruch. He came from Baruch to Hoover, and he went from Hoover back to Baruch. He came from Baruch to Roosevelt, and he went from Roosevelt back to Baruch.

Now, what do we hear? The Roosevelt administration found out that they had to get rid of the general. They found out that the general had messed things up, and that the Roosevelt administration had gotten itself into such a mess—for which it was just as much responsible as Johnson was—that something had to be done about the N. R. A. So the general was in the limelight and on the hot spot, and they had to get rid of General Johnson.

General Johnson, at the time he was going to resign, I know for a fact, called in a newspaper reporter and told him that he was going to give out a statement about "that 'bird' over in the White House", and he was going to make it sing; but he was convinced that probably the best thing to do was to present his resignation and say nothing about it, and get out as quickly as he could. So he got out.

Now, what have they cooked up? The general is a prospective candidate, I hear. They have convinced General Johnson that he can be of service to the administration. He was doing a great disservice to them last night, as I shall demonstrate. But they convinced him that he could be of great service, and they have actually gotten him to believe that he can be elected to the United States Senate from the State of Oklahoma. I understand that the Farley crowd have it now in their minds, and that Mr. Johnson has it in his mind, that he is going to be a candidate for the United States Senate from the State of Oklahoma.

I knew something down here was going crazy, but I never thought they were that crazy until this morning, until I traced down that matter to sources which are absolutely reliable, and found out that it has come to the mind of Farley's adherents that they are in need of the capabilities of General Johnson and that they had opened up the matter, on the eve of some journal giving out a statement to the Redbook Magazine called his memoirs, the beginning of the publication of his memoirs, as the event upon which to justify a loud blast that General Johnson was going to issue throughout the length and breadth of the United States. So General Johnson, on the eve of the publication of his obituary, or his memoirs, as the case may be [laughter]—on the eve of this particular publication, throws wide open the wires of the United States in a manner that I have not been able to get them. I have worked for years and years and years trying to get one of those favorable hours on the radio, and now and then they will drop me back to 11:30, 11 o'clock and 12 o'clock and let me talk to the people who stay up that late; but I never have, in all my efforts which I have been making to get time over the radio, been able to get one of these favorable hours and periods to speak like the general had last night, in which he deluges the country with an attack on me and the priest over in Detroit, and to defend Farleyism and anything with which he ever had to do, including the Roosevelt administration.

So therefore, Mr. President, it becomes a little necessary that we find out, that we explore for the time, if it may

please the Senate, what is the source of this particular effort at this time, and why the reason. First, let us go back to Baruch. Why, here is the man who was running the country—Bernard M. Baruch. We thought we were swapping from Hoover to Roosevelt, and we were swapping from Baruch to Baruch. Now do not doubt me, Mr. President. There are a great many of us here who like proof. I am going to read from the official magazine of J. P. Morgan & Co. This magazine is owned by the House of J. P. Morgan, the American Magazine, owned by the Crowell Publishing Co., and J. P. Morgan owns the Crowell Publishing Co., as was testified by Mr. Morgan's partner, Thomas W. Lamont, before the Banking and Currency Committee last year in reply to questions which I was allowed to propound by reason of the generous attitude of the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER], presiding at the time.

This magazine has an article on Mr. Baruch. I now read to the Senate from an article in 1929 by Barney Baruch, published as an interview given to the special scribe, Mr. Bruce Barton, from the lips of Mr. Baruch. I shall not read all this article, because manifestly it might be too long and burdensome on the Senate, but I want to show the Senate that this Bernard M. Baruch and Hugh Johnson, inside and second-story combination of wreckers of Presidents, have been doing this thing so long, and rigging the market for their own individual profits, that the memory of man runneth not to the contrary, and let there be no dispute about it.

Let me read this article from Brother Baruch to the Senate. I read this excerpt from the American Magazine of June 1929, beginning at page 26. This is Baruch talking now:

Let us trace the business influence of the war a little farther.

That is Baruch speaking. Then he starts again:

The Liberty loan campaigns taught the people to save and invest, first in Liberty bonds, then in municipal and railroad bonds, and then in securities of the corporations which represent the work and genius of the American people.

I am getting to the point gradually here. Here is a propaganda article issued for what was going on in 1929, 4 months before the crash came. Here he says, to begin with, as I have just read, that the war taught the American people to invest—in what? First in Liberty bonds. Next in municipal and railroad bonds. He puts them on a par, municipal and railroad bonds. We will not say anything about the railroad water—just leave that where it is for the present.

Then he says they were taught to invest their money in other corporations of the country. In other words, the market rigging and wild speculation going on on the New York Stock Exchange at the time was particularly being rigged there under the nose and with the consent of and by the spokesman of Hoover, who has later been the spokesman of Roosevelt, who sent down here the men that he had to furnish to run all the important departments of government. Not only did he send Hugh Johnson, but he sent a man named Brown. I forget what the other men's names were, a half a dozen of them or so; but at the same time, 2 years before, in the year 1929, he had built up this rigger with this Johnson and the balance of them that he later put in the department for the United States under Roosevelt. He framed the scheme and loaded the market and befuddled the American people; he used J. P. Morgan's magazine as one of the bellweathers to bring on the wreckage that occurred in September 1929 with Hoover as President of the United States.

Let us now go a little further. What else does he say? I am going to prove this case by his own words. I am going to prove this case so there will not be any denial this time, so there will not be any necessity of ringing over to the White House to find out if this or that is so or not so. I want to leave the matter so there will be no dispute this time. Now, says Baruch:

Instead of fighting the big corporations, the people now own them and enjoy the fruits of their growth.

Oh, they do, do they? Now, is not that fine! [Laughter.] Why, said Baruch unto Hoover, "Don't undertake to regu-

late these market manipulators known as 'the public utilities' or the 'Power Trust.' " "Oh, no", he said, "Oh, no", said this Baruch, this wise counselor, this sagacious supplier of his underlings to the departments of the Government, "Don't fight the corporations; don't bother the Power Trust as it gobbles up everything in sight and then doubles and redoubles up on rates. Oh, no", he says, "the people own these corporations, and they gather the fruits of their prosperity."

How true that was, or rather how untrue that was, came to the sad knowledge of the people later. But let us read further from Baruch. Said he:

The War Industries Board established a new cooperative relationship between Government and business which Mr. Hoover—

Now we are getting down to where Baruch is telling you that Hoover is the man to do this and the man who is doing it, and he recommends him for it. This man who came over here and took charge of the Democratic Party, do not forget that, after we won—this man who came over here and took charge of the Democratic Party after we practically ran him out of the party, after our candidate sent a telegram to Chicago intended for him and those of his stripe, that they did not even have any part to be considered or recognized in the Democratic Party—this man says in 1929, in the month of June, and he must have written this about the month of April or a few months before:

The War Industries Board established a new cooperative relationship between government and business which Mr. Hoover, as Secretary of Commerce, continued in peace times with results that are beyond measure.

In other words, he said Mr. Hoover has gone on with a form that is getting results beyond measure. What are those results?

During the war we established committees of various industries.

Now, here is the N. R. A. They started to pull this N. R. A. under Hoover, and they could not pull it under Hoover, because the Democrats at that time were still fighting along the line of Jefferson to some extent. Not always, but on occasion. They started to pull this N. R. A. under Hoover, and Baruch, who is given credit with Hugh Johnson for putting the bright men behind the N. R. A., had started to pull this shenanigan under Hoover. Wait a minute while I show the Senate. Mr. Baruch said that Mr. Hoover, the Secretary of Commerce, continued the practice.

During the war we established committees of the various industries, and when prices were fixed—

He said:

Rules were also fixed for distribution, and these rules influenced the scale of wages and working conditions.

I just call the Senate's attention to the saying that Mr. Hoover was then on the way, said his spokesman, Baruch, to the fixing of prices and the making of regulations under which businesses would be operated, and he contended that that had in fact had a precedent during the World War and that it should be improved upon and aggravated and accentuated during peace times. Said Mr. Baruch:

Quantity production had its real birth in the war, not only because things had to be made quickly but also because of the necessity for eliminating all useless styles—

Remember that.

and the duplication of effort. We learned to standardize and to make a few styles do the work of many.

In other words, to get rid of competition in America.

I am going to show that that is just what he meant by those words; in just a minute I am going to show that that is what he meant when he put Hugh Johnson down here to run the N. R. A.; and I am going to show that this was not the voice of Esau and the hand of Jacob, or vice versa, but that it was the voice of Baruch and the hand of Baruch under Hoover and the voice of Baruch and the hand of Baruch under Roosevelt; and that today we have nothing under God's eternal sun but a continuation and a perfection

and an accentuation and an aggravation of "Baruchism" under Hoover continuing under Roosevelt up to this date.

Secretary Hoover—

Said Mr. Baruch—

in his Department, continued this important work, and every manufacturer now knows how much more profitable it is to keep the machines running constantly on a few kinds and styles, eliminating the waste of big inventories and of constantly stopping and starting the plant.

The war compelled us to keep a lot of data and statistics.

Continues Mr. Baruch:

The Secretary of Commerce—

That is Mr. Hoover—

wisely continued to do this, and so exposed the public every day to a far wider fund of statistical knowledge than business men had ever had before.

Now, listen to this from Mr. Baruch:

Hoover understood statistics and he endeavored to place them before the people so that they, too, would understand.

Hoover understood statistics and he undertook to place them before the American people so that they, too, would understand—what? Understand what was going on in the way of financial flotations at that day and time. Now wait. Do not depend just on that conclusion. Turn over to page 133, where the article is continued. Here we have it; here we have why they continued these foreign flotations in America. Here we have it all. Says Mr. Baruch:

Through higher wages we gave people the opportunity to indulge their desire for better things and more of them; and then, by development of more flexible credits through installment buying, we enlarged that opportunity.

In other words, enlarged by installment buying which was carried on domestically.

* * * * *

Months ago—

Quoting from Baruch—

I drew up a plan on the lines of which I believed the reparations problem and the debt problem would ultimately be settled. The plan proposed a meeting of representatives of the Germans, the allied nations, and the United States, at which the whole question would be faced afresh. Ten years have passed * * *. We are in a much better position now to know what Germany can really afford to pay and what is both possible and profitable, from the long point of view, in the matter of debt settlements. * * *

Early in 1929, when this was being written, the United States had already agreed to the selection of Owen D. Young and J. P. Morgan as unofficial representatives to attend an international commission on the reparations problem. The best financial minds of Europe and of the United States have high hopes of some such solution as Mr. Baruch suggested.

That is thrown in by Mr. Barton. Then he continues with Mr. Baruch—

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Did he say they were "the best financial minds"?

Mr. LONG. Oh, yes; they were the men to run the thing. Oh, yes; and he has kept that going.

I want to tell the Senate where I first saw Father Coughlin. He had been highly recommended to me by Mr. Roosevelt, by Mr. McIntyre, his secretary, and by Mr. Moley, as being the greatest influence in America. I had never seen Father Coughlin in my life, and had only heard him occasionally for a minute or so over the radio. One night, in my room, just a night or two before they were going to inaugurate Mr. Roosevelt President, a gentleman walked into my room and told me that his name was Coughlin. He said to me, "Have you heard that Mr. Parker Gilbert is here to advise the President, Mr. Roosevelt?" I said, "I do not know Parker Gilbert and never heard of him." "Well", he said, "Parker Gilbert is a member of the banking firm of J. P. Morgan & Co." I said, "You do not mean to tell me that they are putting it out that J. P. Morgan's man has been sent over there again, do you?" He said, "That is what I hear." That was the first time I met Father Coughlin; and he walked up and down the floor a few times and said, "Go and

find out." I came down here and I went into the office of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH]. I went there with some people, and in the course of the conversation I asked the Senator from Idaho if he knew a man by the name of Parker Gilbert. I think he told me he either did know him or that he had heard of him. I asked him about him, and he confirmed that he understood he was here. He did not seem to know what I was asking about particularly. Then I went out, and I found that Mr. Gilbert was here.

I later found out there there was no misunderstanding about that matter. Baruch had recommended to Hoover both Morgan and Young—it does not make any difference which one of them you take; Young is a Democrat and Morgan is either a Republican or a Democrat; tweedledum and tweedledee; there never will be any pure politics until we wipe them both out. I do not care under what banner you put them; one is as bad as the other for the people of America. They cannot run the Democratic Party in my section of the country—not with me down there. [Laughter.]

But it was generally understood, said Mr. Baruch, according to this magazine article, that the financial minds to whom the country should be turned over lock, stock, and barrel were Baruch and his underlings and Morgan and Young. Now I continue reading from this article about Baruch:

His plan or suggestion was that the sum that Germany would pay should be definitely fixed. * * * Mr. Baruch proposed that, of the amount fixed for Germany to pay, part should be represented by an issue of bonds to be secured by German railroads and industrials and to be a first charge against these properties. About \$2,000,000,000 of these bonds should be marketed, and the balance of the bonds, six or eight billions, held in escrow by the Allies, to be sold as and when the international markets would absorb them.

If you want to know where Hoover got the German mark craze from, Mr. President, he got it from the same man Roosevelt got the N. R. A. from. If you want to know who sent Hoover to hell, it is the same man who is sending Roosevelt to hell. That is from whom he got it—Bernard M. Baruch and the lieutenants of his, like Hugh Johnson and Brown and that gang of political second-story workers and financial manipulators who were sent down here. What was the use of going out over the country and talking about Hoover's administration, if we were going to duplicate it? What was the use of making speeches that we were going to chase the money-changers out of the temple, if we were going to let the same man fill it up that had filled up Hoover's temple? I again quote from the article:

If the \$2,000,000,000 or any proportion of them were sold, France, under the so-called "Spa agreement", would get so much and somebody else would get so much.

Further—

Mr. Baruch's suggestion was drawn up with the idea that, if it were carried out, trade and commerce would so increase in the world that tax burdens could be lessened everywhere.

Does this mean that everybody will be prosperous; that there will be no more bad times?

This is Mr. Barton asking Mr. Baruch the question—

Not at all. * * * You can go into any State today and find some farmers making money and other farmers, only a few miles away, having a hard struggle. You find the same situation in the retail stores on any Main Street * * *

Think for a moment what a cheering spectacle the past century presents. In that period we have practically removed the scourge of famine from the world. * * * Food rotted on the ground in one country while people were starving only a few hundred miles away. China and India, where population is dense and modern methods have made little progress, still suffer periodically from famines, but the rest of the world has abolished this specter. Agricultural machinery has made it possible to farm many acres instead of a few. * * * We are within sight of the day when everybody in the world will have enough food all the time.

When we got to that day when there was enough food, then what happened?

I will not read much further from this article, but will ask to have it printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Louisiana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. LONG. I will, however, skip over and read the next thing that shows the idea of Baruch at that time and now. It will show why the N. R. A. did just what it has done. It will show that Baruch intended it when he started it:

Nobody can advise the "average" man on investments—

This is Baruch talking—

and it is furthest from my thought to discuss the temperamental spirit of the stock markets. * * * A friend of mine was talking with an Englishman who had recently come from Canada. As they rode along in an automobile the Englishman pointed to an A. & P. store.

Listen to this if you want to know why the N. R. A. put the little store out of business and dotted this country with A. & P. stores. I will show that you were given fair warning in June 1929 when Bernard M. Baruch was advocating it under Hoover and later on carried it out under Roosevelt:

"What's that?" he asked. "Why, it's a chain grocery store", my friend responded. "What kind of chain stores do you have in Canada?" "We do not have any", the Englishman replied. "That is the first one I ever saw."

My friend thought it incredible, but that night he wrote letters to three men in Canada asking them about chain stores, and from each he received the same reply.

I want Senators to remember that I am coming back in a moment to the specific promise made by Franklin Delano Roosevelt when he was a candidate for the Presidency that the hand of the clock had to be turned back the other way, that the chain store must be curbed, and that the running race, that was a losing race, for the corner grocery store had to be reversed and made more simple for the little man.

But here was Baruch in 1929:

My friend thought it incredible, but that night he wrote letters to three men in Canada asking them about chain stores and from each he received the same reply. A few months later he opened the first store in a chain which has now spread all over the Dominion.

In other words, they have spread them over Canada as they have in the United States.

He has made a large fortune, but he might conceivably have made almost as much as if he had merely stayed at home and invested in the chain-store systems of this country.

In other words, he said this man went to Canada and made a fortune with chain stores in Canada, but that he might have stayed here and invested in chain stores in the United States and done about as well.

Any man who watched the early success of these great systems—

Said Baruch—

must have seen that this was the beginning of a new era of distribution.

Any man who has watched the concentration of these stores into the hands of the few, any man who has watched the blight on the corner grocery stores and the blight on the neighborhood retail stores, any man who has seen his countrymen go out of the little general merchandise stores they had been running, any man must have known that that wake of pestilence, that wake of financial destruction, was the intended policy and growth of the great systems under the policy of Hoover that Baruch was inculcating into him at the time, according to Baruch.

Any man who watched the early success of these great systems must have seen that this was the beginning of a new era of distribution, and that every soundly managed enterprise in this field would be profitable.

Mr. President, I am not going to read further, but he goes on to show, in effect, that the steel mills should come in and be one, that the cotton mills should come in and be one, that all the industry should be patterned along the lines of concentrated monopoly, and that the country should be flooded with German marks and German bonds, and whatever interest the people had in any business should immediately be discontinued and their interests amalgamated in whatever big interests they might be prompted to purchase before the grand crash came in September.

Mr. President, I send to the desk this article of the learned breaker of Presidents and ask that in its entirety it may be inserted in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. LONG. Now, Mr. Johnson comes up. We go ahead and get rid of Mr. Hoover. We are supposed to get rid of Mr. Baruch. I remember when we nominated Roosevelt at Chicago word came in that Mr. Baruch had taken an airplane and left Chicago; that he and his brother had taken an airplane and left. I thought to myself, that is a wonderful sign. Mr. Baruch has quit. He has given up the ghost at last. The Democratic Party has been restored into hands different from those in which the Republican Party has been during the past 4 years.

But Mr. Baruch came down here and suggested the national economy bill, and they hung the club over the head of Congress that it had to be enacted to save the country, and Congress dutifully bowed its head and enacted the national economy bill. We have been trying to get from under the results of that act ever since. Then Mr. Johnson came down here with Mr. Baruch and opened up headquarters and he put Johnson in them before Congress ever passed the law. They had the N. R. A. organized and set up, the desks polished off, telephones put in, and numbers assigned to them on the switchboard before they ever passed the bill through Congress. Baruch knew his business. He had been running this Government before. He knew how to run one. They came down and established the N. R. A. headquarters. It has been given many names—"National Recovery Administration", "National Racketeering Association", "National Ruin Administration", and various other names, depending on how one felt about the administration of the law. None the less it was established and set up and then the law was enacted.

Someone has talked about laws being passed in Louisiana. Somebody talking about it? Oh, yes! There has never been a law passed in my native State until it was passed on by the people and then passed on by the legislature, and yet they call that something that goes counter to the wishes of the people. But here was a case where the N. R. A. was established, when Mr. Johnson came down here with Mr. Baruch, or rather Mr. Baruch brought Hugh Johnson down here and said, "Now, boy, this is your part of the Government. I am putting you in here to run it until you are called out."

He ran it.

Bless your soul, yes, he ran it! How he did run the N. R. A.!

Under that N. R. A. Act they did everything Mr. Baruch said they were going to do before they did it. They performed as nobody had ever seen anyone perform before. They made rules and regulations. They prescribed rules that filled 900 books.

How many men have ever tried to play baseball or football and tried to read the rule book? In all baseball and football games we have to have half a dozen professionals sitting along the sidelines to tell us what the rules are while the game goes on. We have to send all over the country to get them because we do not have enough of them in any one State to keep the game running.

Well, Baruch and Johnson came down here and prescribed 900 sets of rules. Some of those rule books were half the thickness of the unabridged dictionary, I am told. There was rule 1, rule 2, rule 3, subsection (a), subsection (b), subdivision 1 of subsection (a), subdivision 2 of subsection (b), and so on. They provided for investigators to whom the business men had to send their reports during the morning, and for inspectors to whom they had to send their reports at dinner time, and for clerks to whom they had to send their reports at nighttime. They appointed supervisors of inspectors to check them, who could command their reports and file them. Investigators were appointed, secretaries of investigators, inspectors, secretaries of inspectors, supervisors of the secretaries of the supervisors of the inspectors, until they got the poor devils in the country all messed up in a set of 900 books of rules.

They were probably going to the penitentiary if they looked at the rule book, and probably would go to the "pen"

if they did not look at the rule book. They got to the point where they had to call up inspectors and investigators and clerks, where they had to employ lawyers to write letters to get a ruling on whether or not a man could open a can of salmon or sell a can of condensed milk without having this or that or something else done. Then the N. R. A. went into the field to determine how big a ham should be, how it should be packed, how it should be opened—if it ever should be opened—and how it should be trimmed after it was opened; how a can of lard had to be fixed up, and so on, until finally they woke up here, and there was not anything in the United States but these chain stores, and they had put out of business everybody who had managed to swim up to that time. And as we went through looking for the merchants who had been in existence, the factories that had been in existence, and the balance of the things that had been in existence year after year and day after day and night after night, lo and behold! there was the imprint; there was the proof.

Mr. President, we are told that because the Egyptians would not consent to the release of the children of Israel, scourge after scourge was inflicted upon them, and, finally, the Lord said to Pharaoh, "Turn loose the children of Israel, and if you refuse I will take the first-born from every family."

Pharaoh refused, and the Lord commanded of the Israelites that on the night designated everyone should have the blood of the lamb upon his door, that that house might not be stricken by the hand of the avenger. Lo and behold, Mr. President, when the avenging angel arrived, only those places that had the blood of the lamb on the door were excepted from having the first-born stricken by the hand of death.

As we waded through the United States after Bernard M. Baruch had sent Hugh S. Johnson down to Washington and inaugurated the N. R. A., and laid down the rules and the regulations, and appointed the multiplied officials to guide the business men of the country, as we went through the country in the wake of the destruction and disaster and bankruptcies that were found on every hand, only the door that had the blood of Bernard M. Baruch's lamb had been spared in that scourge. Only the door that had been salvaged, only the door that contained the blessing of Bernard M. Baruch, publicly published under Hoover in June 1929, survived the scourge of Bernard M. Baruch and Hugh S. Johnson under Franklin Delano Roosevelt in 1933 and 1934 and 1935; and now they put Hugh on the radio to talk to us!

Why, Mr. President, this remnant of Farleyism reminds me of the story of the poor nigger woman at the burial, where they were lowering her husband into the grave. She appeared for identification, and she was asked who she was, and she said, "I am the wife of these remains." [Laughter.] Have these remains of Farleyism, has this case of bankrupted politics, of discredited management, of political suicide dropped to the incoherent state where they must call even upon one, rebuked in its own order, for a defense? Is there no one left to speak well of what now stands, other than those branded by itself as incompetent and incapable? Must it ransack and scour the whole region with a fine-toothed comb and bring only the articles publicly rebuked and repudiated by it to throw the glamor of respectability on what now stands?

Is that the sad plight of this administration? Is that the present predicament of this maligned order, at the head of which I paraded with a band and tom-tom on the day of enlightenment, when I thought the savior of humanity had at last arrived? Is that what we have driven our ducks to see? Is that the end of the perfect day?

Sad day, Mr. President. It pains my heart, it pains my conscience, it goes back and does dishonor to every cause I ever espoused to see the malefactors themselves called upon as the only persons available to defame those who have undertaken to call back to sanity this administration.

I am going now to do a service to my colleagues. I do not need any help to reelect me to the United States Senate. I can be elected without it. I have only one method by which I can give advice and counsel to my colleagues. It is

not supposed to be exactly parliamentary to expect Senators to pay any attention to advice we give; but, none the less, that is the excuse under which one is permitted to speak here. In other words, we are supposed to be speaking in the order of advising our colleagues. I am going to give party advice. I am going to give advice to men I have met here, men I have admired, men I have loved, men for whom I have a personal affection, men for whom I have a political affection.

Only yesterday the news came to me that one of my colleagues in a neighboring State had complained bitterly, feeling that things I had said might have reacted upon the minds of some people in such a way as to have taken away some of his political support. Such was not my intention then, and it is not my intention now. I do not want them to make the mistakes that I do not make. I do not want them to fall into error and then feel that they have not been warned. There is always a word of warning. There is always, somehow, something set up, somebody interposed to give warning to any and all persons to some extent as to the dangerous grounds upon which they are about to tread.

I am told by the divine element of this country, the ministers of the gospel, that there is a word of warning somewhere sounded to every young man before he takes even his first drink. I am told that before the thief begins his first act of larceny there is some kind of a warning given to him. No man will go out of the United States Senate after this day without having had this warning sounded to him from me, however little attention is paid to it, Mr. President; none the less, with all sincerity.

There is proposed now an investigation to ransack and explore into the depths of this mismanagement and into all of these fracasces that now have spelled scourge and curse to this country. Some men here believe that the spirit of fear will hold Senators back from voting for that investigation. Maybe, but I hope not. I hope there is not anyone here who even feels fear—political fear, fear that he may do something distasteful to the people, or to someone else. Some there are who, because of the spirit of fear, and some there are who, for blind partisanship, may be led to believe—I hope not—that nothing should be done about Farleyism and Baruchism and Johnsonism at this time, because Johnson was an agent serving under the order.

There was an entwined situation with Johnson and Baruch and Farley, whereby one was for all, and all were for one.

I warn them now, let us not put behind us what we promised the people in 1932. Let us strike this cancer with death. Let us investigate Farleyism. Farley contends that he is an innocent lamb. Mr. President, I never have read Mark Twain's works. I am told that he wrote a book that he called "Innocents Abroad." I do not know just what he meant to imply by "Innocents Abroad"; but I see, from reading a copy of the letter which Farley sent to the United States Senate committee, that he says that in the collection of all this money from Government employees and criminals indicted by men he rewarded, with his own name at the top of the letterhead, and in his sight—with all that done, and with prosecutions he is urging against others, he was entirely innocent as to the source from which he was receiving the money.

Mr. President, I have never read Innocents Abroad, but this is a case of "innocents aboard." [Laughter.] I cannot understand how a reasonable man can think that that gentleman can sit here, within a few steps of the dome of the Capitol, with letter after letter bearing his own name at the masthead, and in many cases his own signature, carried to the employees, carried to the criminals indicted, and then plead that there is an innocent sitting there, receiving the money, and expending it as he does.

So I give warning to the party, I give warning to the Senate, I sound warning to the country: We have gone 2 years. Where do we find ourselves at the end of 2 years? We are now in the third year. We are no longer in the second year; we are in the third year. As a matter of fact, if we compute it from the date of the election, we are well

into the third year. How many unemployed have we? Eleven and a half million, according to the industrial statistics, or thereabouts. How many agriculturally unemployed have we? According to the statistics of 1933, compared with the statistics of 1929, there was 54 percent less income of the agricultural people in 1933 than in 1929.

It is said that the agricultural income rose in 1934. Maybe it did; but if it did rise the billion dollars that is estimated, the income of the farming population in 1934 would still be away down below, perhaps as far as 40 to 50 percent below, the income of the same farming class in 1929.

With that kind of a showing, where is the end of the dole? Where is the end of poverty? Where is the gleam of the light that was to strike from all that stalking form of want and misery? Mr. President, nineteen and a half million people rely upon the dole today. The professional man, the doctor, the lawyer, the candlestick maker, who is not listed in the unemployed class because he never was on anybody's pay roll, stalks the streets today practically as idle as though he had been a man dismissed from the service of an industrial or agricultural employer.

Where is this to end? What better is there to come? What is held out to people to lead them to believe that relief is to be offered them?

Oh, there is one relief they were giving to the universities of the United States—as much as \$15 per student—so that young men might go to the State and other universities. Those young men were subsisting on \$15 a month. The universities were meeting some of the expense, so that a young man granted \$15 from the Government could attend a university and educate himself.

They have announced that they are going to discontinue that, that they are going to improve the C. C. C. camps, that they are going to expand the C. C. C. camps, which cost from \$35 to \$50 a month per young man who will go out there in the woods and learn the magnificent work of planting saplings and fighting the mosquitoes, the red bugs, and the ticks, and nothing else. They will pay \$35 to \$50 a month to send a young man into a C. C. C. camp, whence he will come with experience in fighting red bugs, instead of spending \$15 less per person and send more young men to the universities and give them an education.

I sound a warning. I heard my friend the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], when my friend who has departed from this body, the former Senator from Ohio, Mr. Fess, was making a speech about what would happen the next year, remark to the Senator from Arkansas: "Why should the Senator from Arkansas be concerned about what the Senator from Ohio is prophesying will occur next year? Why," he said to the Senator from Arkansas, "does not the Senator from Arkansas know that the Senator from Ohio will not be here next year?"

Mr. President, that was a true prophecy if one was ever uttered.

Now, I would sound another warning to the Senator from Arkansas, as my friend the Senator from Mississippi sounded one to him then: Beware! Beware! If things go on as they have been going on, you will not be here next year. [Laughter.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Demonstrations in the galleries are against the rules of the Senate; and, if persisted in, the rule will be invoked and the galleries will be cleared.

EXHIBIT A

[From the American Magazine for June 1929]

BERNARD M. BARUCH DISCUSSES THE FUTURE OF AMERICAN BUSINESS

By Bruce Barton

You have seen on the stage the office of a big Wall Street financier. The scene rocks with the clatter of tickers, the ringing of telephones, the crush and cries of brokers and telephone boys. Well, Bernard Baruch has been as active as any dramatist could wish and still undertakes major financial and industrial operations, but his office resembles this stage version in just about the same way that a pastor's study resembles a railroad station.

A sunny private room. No ticker. A telephone, but it seldom rings. Thick rugs on the floor; a few fine paintings on the walls. A mahogany desk unencumbered by papers. Behind the desk a tall man, distinguished by supple grace and good looks, with pleasant eyes and a mouth that breaks easily into a smile; silver-gray hair and a strong nose—the sort of nose that Napoleon used

to look for in his generals. The man, who is 53, looks as if he has the blood pressure of a boy of 25, and he seems to have nothing whatever to do. This is Baruch.

We went out to luncheon one day. The first part of our conversation related to the war. It is a painful confession, but true, that I am always behind with my wars. The Civil War still absorbed me when the World War came along, and only now, after 10 years of peace, when the real inside stories are beginning to come out, have I begun to transfer my interest to this latest and biggest conflict. Baruch knows as many of these inside stories as any man in America. As chairman of the War Industries Board, he sat at Woodrow Wilson's right hand and marshaled the industries of the Nation. The presidents of companies who had been violent competitors met around his table. Sometimes they entered cheerfully into his plan for pooling their output; sometimes they protested. Eventually, guided by Baruch's patience and tact and good humor, they learned a lesson in cooperation which has repaid them many times over for any sacrifice the war demanded. That cooperation within the ranks of industries is one of the present factors in our prosperity.

I asked Baruch to mention some of the other factors, and he began by remarking that when men try to judge the present, or to forecast the future, by using the yardsticks of the past, they show no comprehension of the tremendous changes which were beginning even before the war broke out and which were accelerated by it.

"Let us look back for a minute before we try to look forward", he said. "The first important change was the Federal Reserve Act, which gave us coordinated control of our financial resources and made credit the servant of business instead of its master. The second was the Adamson Act, which made the 8-hour day permanent in the railroads. It was resisted by many leaders, who believed that it meant higher prices for everything and consequent hardship to the consuming public, but its influence has been altogether different. The shorter day and the increased wage, which were enacted as a matter of social justice, have come now to be recognized by almost everybody as essential elements in prosperous business. In the old days it was assumed that you must keep wages low and hours long in order to operate effectively. We know now that low wages mean low purchasing power, and that only in proportion as men and women have money to spend and hours in which to enjoy the fruits of their expenditure can our productive capacity be kept fully employed.

"Let us trace the business influence of the war a little further", he continued. "The Liberty Loan campaigns taught the people to save and invest, first in Liberty bonds, then in municipal and railroad bonds, and then in securities of the corporations which represent the work and genius of the American people. Instead of fighting the big corporations, the people now own them and enjoy the fruits of their growth. The War Industries Board established a new cooperative relationship between government and business which Mr. Hoover, as Secretary of Commerce, continued in peace times with results that are beyond measure. During the war we established committees of the various industries, and when prices were fixed, rules were also fixed for distribution, and these rules influenced the scale of wages and working conditions. This helped to lift the standard of all wages, which the manufacturer later found was a fine thing, though he fought it strenuously at first.

"Another thing the American business man found during the war—that he could do things he never thought he could do, and make things that he used to think only the Englishman or the German or the Frenchman could make for him. He made dyes, for example. He made all sorts of articles that had previously been made abroad, and found substitutes for many others. These activities continued after the peace, because we had the money to continue them with and the equipment, as well as labor of unusual intelligence.

"Quantity production had its real birth in the war, not only because things had to be made quickly, but also because of the necessity for eliminating all useless styles and the duplication of efforts. We learned to standardize and to make a few styles do the work of many. Secretary Hoover, in his Department, continued this important work, and every manufacturer now knows how much more profitable it is to keep the machines running constantly on a few kinds and styles, eliminating the waste of big inventories and of constantly stopping and starting the plant.

"The war compelled us to keep a lot of data and statistics. The Secretary of Commerce wisely continued to do this, and so exposed the public every day to a far wider fund of statistical knowledge than business men had ever had before. Hoover understood statistics and he endeavored to place them before the people so that they, too, would understand.

"So we came out of the war having vastly expanded our productive capacity and self-confidence. We came out a creditor Nation, which might possibly have happened in 25 years of peace, but was actually accomplished in 3 or 4 years of war. As such a creditor Nation we were in a position to lend money all over the world and get foreign trade in return. We came out with a unified banking system, the best security against those alternating periods of inflation and stringency which had made our business history a series of feasts and famines. Finally, we came out with business men who knew a great deal more than they ever did before about how to get the facts and interpret them, and who were believers in a popular high standard of living and of wages."

"You mentioned that before," I suggested.

"I know that, but it looms larger in my mind than anything else. For the first time, every banker and manufacturer realized

that the more money people have, the more things they can buy; that the desire for more things and better things is the main-spring of production. Through higher wages, we gave people the opportunity to indulge their desire for better things and more of them, and then, by development of more flexible credits through installment buying, we enlarged that opportunity. The basis of our prosperity is our own domestic market, which we have vastly enlarged by this simple process of increasing the power to consume. And don't think for a minute that this new spirit of wanting more things and being willing to work for them is confined to the United States. Individuals all over the world are potential consumers to the physical capacity of individuals here. All they lack is equal financial capacity, and that is not beyond their possibilities."

I pressed Baruch on this point.

"Months ago," he said, "I drew up a plan on the lines of which I believed the reparations problem and the debt problem would ultimately be settled. The plan proposed a meeting of representatives of the Germans, the allied nations, and the United States, at which the whole question would be faced afresh. Ten years have passed since the peace conference and 4 years since the Dawes plan went into effect. We are in a much better position now to know what Germany can really afford to pay and what is both possible and profitable, from the long point of view, in the matter of debt settlements.

"The settlement of the debt and reparations problems would bring such a revival of industry in the whole world, and the demand for things would be so great, that it would result in what, for want of a better term, we might call 'an industrial renaissance.' These two questions have been like dragging anchors to the great ship of international commerce, which has been slowly gaining headway and is only approaching moderate speed in this country. If the reparations question is settled by fixing Germany's indebtedness definitely at a sum that she can pay and is willing to pay, so the Allies can get money sufficient to meet their requirements and their debt to America, and if America will take some of this cash as a settlement, the whole international financial question would change immensely for the better. The higher standards of living which we enjoy here, the construction of railroad terminals, airports, magnificent roads, bridges, and tunnels, which have contributed so much to our progress, would be duplicated in other countries as fast as they are able to get the means. The automobile, and the airplane, the moving picture, television, and the radio would carry to the farthest corners of the earth accurate pictures of the standards of living of the better countries, creating desires to emulate them the world over—the irresistible urge to do, to achieve, and to have.

"Incidentally, the fair and proper settlement of this question will do more for agriculture than anything that could be done politically."

At this point it is only fair to Mr. Baruch to point out that he outlined his plan for settlement of the reparations question 3 years ago. I had talked to him about it early in the spring of 1928. Early in 1929, when this was being written, the United States has already agreed to the selection of Owen D. Young and J. P. Morgan as unofficial representatives to attend an international commission on the reparations problem. The best financial minds of Europe and of the United States have high hopes of some such solution as Mr. Baruch suggested.

His plan, or suggestion, was that the sum that Germany would pay should be definitely fixed in amount and should be a sum that Germany can pay and would try to pay. Under the Dawes plan the railroads were obligated, and certain first charges were made against the industries of Germany. Mr. Baruch proposed that of the amount fixed for Germany to pay, part should be represented by an issue of bonds to be secured by German railroads and industries and to be a first charge against these properties. About \$2,000,000,000 of these bonds should be marketed, and the balance of the bonds, six or eight billions, held in escrow by the Allies to be sold as and when the international markets would absorb them.

If the two billions, or any proportion of them, were sold, France, under the so-called "Spa agreement", would get 52 percent and the other countries their proportionate share, as determined by the same agreement. If France were thus to get 52 percent of the two billion, she would have \$1,000,000,000 in cash for any purpose for which she determined to use it. Mr. Baruch's main idea was that with such an amount France could negotiate a cash settlement for her debt to America, and when further bonds were sold she and England could make further cash settlements with us and still have a credit to their accounts in the balance of the bonds.

The bonds would be a first charge on all Germany, as they would be secured by her railroads and industries, as outlined above, and be issued in all the gold currencies of the world—dollars, francs, pounds, lire, and marks. The citizens of the world would buy them, because they would be the best bonds ever issued internationally.

Mr. Baruch's suggestion was drawn up with the idea that if it were carried out, trade and commerce would so increase in the world that tax burdens could be lessened everywhere. If the United States were paid in cash, she could retire Liberty bonds, reducing the yearly interest on her obligations, and give an opportunity for the reduction of taxes or the use of that money for some other purpose. When I asked him to discuss this plan in detail, he declined to do so because, he said, the matter was now definitely in the hands of the Reparations Commission. But he added, "I am not in the least averse to forecasting the results of such a settlement. I believe that trade and commerce all over

the world would be immensely benefited and interest rates would lessen, because the demand for gold by the great central banks, which no longer would be dominated by fear, would lessen materially.

"Something of that sort," he added, "I am confident is going to be worked out. And when it has been worked out, I believe we shall enter upon a new period of world-wide production and distribution, which future historians may call the 'industrial renaissance.'"

I asked him what he meant by the term "industrial renaissance."

"That's a new phrase to me," I said.

"Maybe it isn't properly descriptive, but I'll tell you what it means to me."

"I have already said that the desire for more and better things—for a higher standard of living—is the real beginning of increased business. Until people are conscious of the want for an article there can be no real market for that article. People saw the automobile and wanted it immediately. About the same time increased wages and credit facilities made it possible for them to have it. That began the fabulous development of the automobile industry. People see airplanes, and when enough of them really want airplanes—are 'air conscious' as they say—then the airplane industry will be a prodigious industry."

"Now, this process of wanting is already spreading all over the world. The spirit of tearing down the old and building something new and better which you see on every hand in this country has spilled over into every other country. Everywhere in our own land are new roads, new bridges, new subways, new terminals. Everywhere the burden of toil is being lifted off the shoulders of men by machinery and lightened in the home by electricity. The movie and the radio and the airplane are carrying the picture of our new standard of living into every corner of the globe, and wherever the picture is carried there is created desire."

"Before the war there were hundreds of millions of people who had too little hope and too much fear to desire anything. They were born to live and die within the same narrow limits as their fathers before them. If the father had been a peasant, the son must be a peasant; if the father had been a porter, the son could expect nothing better. Everything was fixed, curbed, static. Then came the war, tumbling over thrones, destroying feudal privileges, and wiping out feudal fortunes. The process went too far, of course, as in Russia, where the people experienced a rush of liberty to the head and attempted to beat economic laws that are as fixed and unbeatable as the law of gravitation. But the great effect of the war, aside from its suffering and destruction of wealth, was in jarring dead brain cells into life, throwing people out of ruts, striking down barriers and chains, and giving hundreds of millions of people the right to look forward, to hope and to have."

"When all that wanting and hoping begins to find expression through increased productivity, millions of families will begin to apply in some degree the American formula of 'work and have more.' There will follow, in my judgment, such an expansion of production, such a work of rebuilding, such an interchange of goods through foreign trade as we have never experienced before. For the first time in history we have sound reason to hope for a long period of peace. For the first time the business men of all nations are supplied with statistical information, together with some understanding of the laws of economics. For the first time we have sound centralized banking systems in all the countries and close cooperation between these systems internationally. Because all these factors are favorable, and because of the universal stirring of desire and ambition, to which I have already referred, I believe in the 'industrial renaissance.' We are already seeing something of it in the United States."

"Does this mean that everybody will be prosperous, that there will be no more 'bad times'?" I asked.

"Not at all. There will always be inequalities in human intelligence and industry. You can go into any State today and find some farmers making money and other farmers, only a few miles away, having a hard struggle. You can find the same situation in retail stores on any Main Street. You can look into any big business and see two men who started as boys together and are now far apart. We shall never have any social set-up that can insure equal prosperity for everybody. But we are beginning to conquer some of the obstacles which have unfairly handicapped humanity in general in the past."

"Think for a moment what a cheering spectacle the past century presents. In that period we have practically removed the scourge of famine from the world. Only a century ago it was considered inevitable that some portion of the race should be afflicted with famine almost every year. Food rotted on the ground in one country while people were starving only a few hundred miles away. China and India, where population is dense and modern methods have made little progress, still suffer periodically from famines, but the rest of the world has abolished this specter. Agricultural machinery has made it possible to farm many acres instead of a few; transportation, cold storage, and other scientific devices enable one section of the world to exchange its produce with other sections that are thousands of miles away. We are within sight of the day when everybody in the world will have enough food all the time."

"Similarly, we are making great progress in the conquest of disease. Smallpox, typhoid, diphtheria, yellow fever, and diabetes have been, if not conquered, at least greatly diminished through the magnificent work and sacrifice of scientists."

"Today, with the motor, the radio, and improved sea, land, and air travel, and with television almost upon us, who shall be alone,

what place isolated, who be separated from the comforts and solace of his fellow man?"

"Our generation has seen the first halting steps toward the abolition of war, and more good influences are at work in this direction than ever before."

"One foe we have made little progress against until very recently, namely, the panics and depressions in business which from time to time have shut down industries and brought fear and distress to millions of homes."

"The point to be emphasized is that we now have certain safeguards which never existed before: The Federal Reserve bank; the better understanding and use of statistics by the nations, by banks and industries, and by individuals; the coordination of the financial systems of all the leading nations; and the great increase of human wants and ambitions throughout the world which, with occasional and temporary set-backs, ought to provide a huge volume of business for many years to come."

"Assuming that all this is true," I asked, "how should the average man proceed in forecasting his own life for the next few years? What plans can he make for his individual investments?"

"Nobody can advise the 'average' man on investments, and it is furthest from my thought to discuss the temperamental spirit of the stock markets. There are certain principles, but the application of these principles rests with the individual in the infinite variety of his circumstance. The average man keeps his eyes not more than half open. He does not train himself to see what is going on around him. He hopes that some day somebody will happen along and give him an inside tip or some advance information that will make his fortune overnight. As a matter of fact, the best tips of all are written so large and plain that anybody with imagination can read and profit by them."

"You asked me as we sat down how I happened to be interested in radio. Who could fail to be interested in it? Who, with any imagination at all, could experience the miracle of a concert in his own home and not realize that this is a new force which is bound to give rise to great industries?"

"A friend of mine was talking with an Englishman who had recently come from Canada. As they rode along in an automobile, the Englishman pointed to an A. & P. store. 'What's that?' he asked."

"'Why, it's a chain grocery store,' my friend responded. 'What kind of chain stores do you have in Canada?'"

"'We do not have any,' the Englishman replied. 'That is the first one I ever saw.'"

"My friend thought it incredible, but that night he wrote letters to three men in Canada asking them about chain stores, and from each he received the same reply. A few months later he opened the first store in a chain which has now spread all over the Dominion. He has made a large fortune, but he might conceivably have made almost as much if he had merely stayed at home and invested in the chain-store systems of this country. Any man who watched the early success of these great systems must have seen that this was the beginning of a new era of distribution, and that every soundly managed enterprise in this field would be profitable."

"When Alexander Graham Bell at one end of a wire called into his crude instrument, 'Watson, come here; I want you', and Watson came, it was the beginning of fortunes for all who had the vision to look ahead. When Lindbergh flew the Atlantic, it opened a new day of interest and progress for the aviation companies. When the first crude motion pictures flickered across the screen, it signaled opportunity to another group of people. The great chances do not come secretly."

"Quite as important as inventions or industries are men to manage and be responsible for them. It is better to back a strong, able man than take a chance on the most alluring prospect where the management is untried."

"One of my associates in the War Industries Board was a big-boned, two-fisted man from Chicago named Alex Legge. Somebody rightly called him 'the Abraham Lincoln of industry.' He was at that time general manager of the International Harvester Co. The way he handled things gave his associates great respect for his ability, and when the war was over many of them said to themselves, 'Let's just follow Alex.' So they bought International Harvester stock, to their great gain. So anyone could have done in a score of similar instances."

"The records of business leaders are no secret. Every man, even in the smallest town, is in a position to know something of the life stories and achievements of the men who are directing the important industries. If he does not know, his local banker does. Charles M. Schwab once remarked that he made it a rule to do business only with lucky men, by which he meant with men who had demonstrated their capacity in a series of situations. It is a good rule. If you follow, in your investments, the men who have succeeded, you are likely also to succeed, assuming always, of course, that the industries with which they are engaged satisfy fundamental human needs."

"I do not mean to say that a man can make his investment in any enterprise, however good and ably managed, and then go to sleep. Business is never static; it is forever moving, forever subject to the fluctuating influences of scientific discovery and consumer demand. These changes, which seem sometimes to come very suddenly, are not usually so sudden. They cast their shadows before them, and he who keeps his eyes open may see and be warned in time."

"If you pick the 10 leading industries in the United States, excluding for the moment the railroads, which operate only at home, you will find that every one of them is set up to do business all over the world and that their foreign business has extended

rapidly in the past few years. You will find that every one of them maintains scientific research on a broad scale, which is insurance that it will not be left behind by scientific progress, and will have the benefit of whatever new processes and products such research may develop. You will find that every one of them is headed by men of demonstrated success, who have surrounded themselves with capable assistants, trained to carry on.

"There is no mystery in these criteria of probable industrial progress. Economic and industrial news is available to everybody everywhere. The conclusions to be derived from it are simply applications of common sense. In broad and general terms progress is on the march. The economic condition of the world seems on the verge of a great forward movement. As to particular companies, and even as to particular industries, some are in phases of ascendancy, some few are retrograding. The wise investor will seek the former and avoid the latter. Having satisfied himself that he is in a fruitful field, he will seek to learn something about the companies he favors—the field of their particular endeavor, the men who are responsible for them, the policy of their operations. In the long run he cannot go far wrong if he relies on progress—not already too far anticipated—if he relies on what I have called 'the industrial renaissance.' As an old friend used to say to me as a youngster, 'How many bears do you know with residences on Fifth Avenue?' I can recall none.

"Of course, there is no royal road. Bob Fitzsimmons used to say that to be a champion a man must learn to take as well as give. This has always been in my thoughts when I have seen men under the punishment of life, and I may add that I know no champions anywhere who have not had their experience in taking it.

"There will, of course, be temporary set-backs due to causes perhaps more or less avoidable. Finance will be a limiting factor until that subject is better understood and worked out, but I am not speaking in terms of weeks or months when I say I think the great economic surge is forward.

"Also, in a large politico-economic unit such as the United States, the powers of government are so vast that if they be unwisely applied, they can hamper or even destroy a natural period of prosperity.

"Mr. Hoover clearly pointed out in his campaign speeches that we have pushed efficiency in machine production to a point where, in order to keep our people gainfully employed, we must continue to produce in ever-increasing amount an industrial surplus beyond the capacity of our domestic market to absorb. In other words, our industrial prosperity depends on a rapidly expanding export trade. Industry is fast approaching the dependence on export markets that has given agriculture such distress. I cannot avoid some apprehension over the recent demands in Washington for tariffs amounting to embargoes on the importation of everything. Tariff protection is a complicated and highly technical subject. This much is clear. A prohibitive tariff would inevitably force our best customers into defensive tariff agreements. For example, I cannot conceive of the Argentine and Canada taking no steps to retaliate on any attempt to exclude their exports to us. They would raise walls against us, and the hands of our progress in those fields could be set back years in a week. Similarly for all American Republics and France, England, and Germany. They would create mutual relations among themselves to the restriction of our export market, and we could not fail to suffer loss.

"Such a result I do not fear because I know Mr. Hoover to be too sound in his economics and too keenly aware of our necessity in this regard to permit such a thing, despite the clamoring with which he is already assailed. He will use the protective principles to preserve the markets which are rightly ours and, I trust, to relieve agriculture in that very limited field where protection will be of benefit."

"Yes," I said, "you have just said that the ability to take punishment is one of the essentials."

"The really essential attributes may sound trite," Mr. Baruch replied, "but, to my way of thinking, they are courage, integrity, and application. When a man has made up his mind to believe in the country and its industries, and to go forward with them, he must be willing to take the temporary set-backs along with the progress. He must keep his faith firm and not let any little thing unsettle his decision. As for integrity, what can any man add to what has already been said?"

Baruch was thoughtfully regarding a picture of his father, Dr. Simon Baruch, the distinguished surgeon and scientist, whose services and research have left a permanent impress on medical knowledge and practice. The photograph was inscribed to his son, with the words, "Let unswerving integrity always be your guide."

I looked at the picture and put it back on the desk.

It has been said that there is no sentiment in business. Some day I shall write a piece about fathers and mothers—the fathers and mothers of these well-known men in Wall Street. But, as Mr. Kipling would say, that will be another story.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, in view of the extensive references by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long] to the speech delivered last night in New York by Gen. Hugh S. Johnson, I ask unanimous consent that, as a matter of common fairness, the text of General Johnson's speech be inserted in the RECORD at the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from Louisiana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

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

[From the New York Times, Mar. 5, 1935]

TEXT OF GENERAL JOHNSON'S SPEECH

This is March 4. Two years ago this morning, in a national gloom surely as deep as that of the days when Washington stood in the snow at Valley Forge or Lee marched over the mountain wall toward Gettysburg, Franklin Roosevelt knelt at an altar and prayed. Then he went to the Capitol and registered the vow in heaven that placed upon his back as heavy a freight of human hopes as ever was borne by any man. Our trust was in him so completely that the general prayer was: "Provide him with all power that he may save us." Today, shadows have fallen thwart that faith—and it is my purpose here—with what force God has given me—to smash at two of them.

The chaos of that hour has been too often told. Banks, holding the savings of the entire country, tottered. The head of the United States Chamber of Commerce was urging that the President be made industrial dictator, and the very captains of big business were asking Washington to save them.

Agriculture—bled white by years of disaster—was praying for a miracle. Force, as the only means of escape, was being used to resist foreclosure of tens of thousands of farms and homes. Labor was helpless—its organization prostrate and vanishing—its wages drying up and its hours extended.

No one will ever know the full spread of unemployment at that moment. Nor will anyone ever know how close were we to collapse and revolution. We could have had a dictator a lot easier than Germany got Hitler and we would have had one but for the President himself, to whom the whole idea was hateful.

HOLDS DEMOCRACY FAILS IN ANY GREAT CRISIS

A democracy is the best government in the world for peace and prosperity, but it is the worst government in the world for a great war or a great crisis—that is the reason for six dictators in Europe. But there is one single exception—the phenomenal habit of the American people, at any sacrifice, to give a constitutional President extraordinary powers and to stick together with him at the hours of extreme peril. In the worst armed crisis in the world, Woodrow Wilson proved that, acting together under the Constitution, our people could wage modern war better than the most absolute military autocracy in Europe.

In the worst business crisis in the world, Franklin Roosevelt proved that they could thus fight depression better than any dictator under the sun. Wilson expressed the rule, "The highest and best form of efficiency is the spontaneous cooperation of a free people." In 1933 we had that cooperation, just as in 1917 and 1918 we had it. In 1935 we have it not. The lack of it, in the dark threat that still hangs over this country, is the greatest menace of our immediate future. The men who have sought with some success to break it up may have more to answer to the country for than they at this moment dream.

Sustained and supported by a united people, the President moved to his terrible task with greater speed than has ever been shown by any government. He cleared up the banking ruin. He took steps that have raised agriculture to within a few percent of its relative pre-war position—almost a miracle. He brushed the cloud of foreclosure and loss from tens of thousands of threatened farms and homes. He took the first effective steps to abolish child peonage and to run sweat shops out of existence.

TELLS OF AID TO LABOR AND SMALL BUSINESSES

He raised all wages, shortened all weekly hours from an average 52 to an average 40—think of it! He established the principle of collective bargaining on a national front, and he did more for labor in this country in 1 year than all the strife and strikes and all the laws and political parties from the very adoption of the Constitution to this day. He took comfortable care of millions of the destitute and warded off the danger to our country of the continued presence of vast unemployment. He opened the way for industry to freedom from old abuses, cut-throat competition, and monopolistic price-slashing. He actually saved tens of thousands of little fellows in business from the economic slaughter by chains and monopoly that had been going on for 10 years past.

He lifted the country at least a third of the way out of a depression caused by many years of economic and political folly. It was so great a performance of leadership and courage done in so short time that you cannot find a parallel in history by which to gage and measure it. It was part of a general long-pull plan, and these astonishing results were a sufficient proof of that plan to justify the faith of any man that, given even a reasonable time to work it out and to correct errors, there was no reason to expect failure. Any fool knows that you cannot clear the wreckage of 12 years' madness in 2 years' time. But the push is gone. The drive is stopped. Many of these benefits have faded. The plan seems to be in the gravest danger of frustration.

APPEALS FOR RESTORATION OF SPIRIT OF COOPERATION

The reason for this is not hard to find. The "spontaneous cooperation of a free people"—without which any democracy at a time like this is in danger of either a licking or a dictator—is gone. It has been broken up into selfish warring groups by the deliberate design of business and political guerrillas. If we can't restore something of the solidarity and enthusiasm of 1933 among our whole people, and do it quickly, we are in for trouble of the most serious sort, for if a chaos of inflation and worse follows a frustration of

these plans nothing we can hope to do will keep a dictator out of Washington and that chaos is imminently threatened.

Let me give you an example. In July 1933 the President appealed to industry for the Blue Eagle. Within 3 months 96 percent of affected industry had hoisted that bird and, as revealed by an actual census in October 1933, they had created 2,785,000 jobs. I have heard that questioned, but you can't question that actual count. Think of it! Three months—96 percent of industry—nearly 3,000,000 jobs! Why, the thing was a marvel! It restored hope; it proved for the first time in 4 years of unrelieved disappointment and failure that depression is not unbeatable, that something can be done about it. It changed the outlook of a nation.

That is more than double the number of jobs that have been made by all the billions we have spent and all the agencies of government, industry, and commerce put together from that day to this, and it never took a cent in taxes or put any freckle-necked American on a dole. My greatest glory is the recent taunt about the man that made 3,000,000 jobs and lost his own. It was possible only because it was done on a plan for everybody to act together, at the same time, in one concerted pull in which every person in this country had some part—and there was hardly a single slacker in this first big effort.

Why, this country can do anything if it has the will. Like Andy Jackson, it can go to heaven—if it wants to. It was the greatest demonstration of the spontaneous cooperation of a free people that we have ever had. It could not have happened in any other country at any other time or under any other leader than the President.

I think most of that good had been undone—many of those jobs lost—and my point in mentioning it at all at this time is this: It could not be done today! It could not even be started. Nothing could be more eloquent of the almost complete destruction of the solidarity in which our people started to pull itself out of this hole.

It has been said that these extraordinary measures were not authorized by the people in the 1932 elections. What utter rot! Why, after they were all clearly shown, the people at the 1934 elections gave the President and what he had done one of the most overwhelming approvals they have ever uttered. Men of both parties who otherwise had not a Chinaman's chance went into this Congress because they pledged to support those plans. They rode in on the horizontal coat tails of a speeding Chief.

Some of these very men are already recorded in opposition. The country gave the President the ball on this play, but we already see a lot of halfocks on his own side trying to take it and run the other way with it. We cannot get out of our trouble that way. When they do that successfully they will take the full responsibility for certain failure, not only because they will have spoiled one unified plan that was working but because they will have substituted a mess of contradictory and confusing nightmares of their own.

"ECONOMIC KIBITZERS" SNIPING AT PRESIDENT

In our representative government changes like that do not occur without some ferment back home. Something has happened since the last election. Some of our economic kibitzers and political pansies, who have been sniping at the President's plans since the beginning, say that things have been getting so much better, that our free people do not feel the need of any more spontaneous cooperation, and yearn for their rugged individualism back again. That is a bunch of bunk! A very few big corporations, who ought to know better at a time like this, have been making large profits, but the unemployment and relief rolls remain at the same hopeless levels left after the great upward surge of 1933. But that is the very thing which made the old ruggedness so hateful to our people. The ferment back home is not the leaven of a rising loaf—it is the bubbling of a sour mash.

Party labels don't mean very much in this country any more. We used to talk about two parties and a lunatic fringe. Just now I think there are three groups—rather than parties—and that now two of them are lunatic fringes.

The first fringe is the Old Guard itself and its hereditary following. They are what they are because yesterday they were—and their fathers before them—and for no better reason. They learn nothing and they forget nothing. They believe that property and profits come first, and that if you take care of them the humanities will take care of themselves. They think that the way to do that is to keep the Government in a cast-iron mold—and finally that the benefits of this country cannot be entrusted to popular control but must all trickle down to the grass roots through a sieve made up of small groupings of the wise, the good, and the beneficent—old stuff, very old stuff, the mere recital of which, in this troubled modern day, is a challenge to revolt.

The second fringe is the residue. They have emotions rather than beliefs. They are like a harp-of-the-winds upon which any breeze can play a tune, and they do not care a hoot about the essence or form of any government that blocks their desires or restricts their impulses. Here is smoking flax which any wind can fan to flame if it is strong enough and blows from the right direction. "Liberty," said Lenin, "is a capitalistic dream." Mussolini adds, "Fascism has no idols. It has trodden over the putrescent corpse of the goddess of liberty and it will do it again." And my good friend Henry Wallace says, "Liberty must go into eclipse in times of depression."

Between these fringes, there is the group that grew out of this depression, of which Franklin Roosevelt is the leader. It believes that this Government is good, but that, in a crisis, it ought to mold itself to changing conditions—that property and the profit system

must be preserved but that the humanities come first and should be taken care of by direct action—and finally, that this country and the fullness thereof belongs in fee simple to the people of the United States and not merely in trust for them through some political or business group or steering committee.

In a gusty world where old political systems fall like autumn leaves, I think the compromise and flexibility of this middle group is our only safety. I think the Old Guard has become a lunatic fringe because, having so plainly dosed the country into this misery, the stark crass stupidity, of standing and offering nothing more than the same old poison to millions—still destitute from the first dose—is an actual incitation to revolution if there arose the slightest danger of their return to power—and I think there is the slightest danger. I have a letter reciting a recent gleeful dinner of six such Senators who were happy over their own assertion: "The next election is in the bag—all we have to do is to sit still and laugh—HUEY LONG and Father Coughlin are going to give it to us." From their standpoint that is good horse sense. It pits both ends against the middle, but it is no laughing matter. For, if there is such a thing as playing volley ball with dynamite bombs—this is the prize example.

80,000,000 IN NATION IN ABUSED BABY CLASS

HUEY LONG and Father Coughlin are rapidly appearing as leaders of the second—the emotional—fringe. The danger from that group is that any desperate person is a potential candidate to join it. If you box your boy's ears he will pout and, if occasion offers, run away from home with any enticing bum who comes along. He is an abused baby. Counting busted business men, the unemployed, large segments of farmers not yet helped, and the dependents of all these, there are about 80,000,000 abused babies in this country—their ears still tingling from the worst economic boxing in history. They are ready to strike back at disaster in any way that is shown to them. The new deal offered them something to support and trust. Neither in 1932 or 1934 was there anybody else in the field with any opposition or anything like a concrete plan, and they had the comfort of believing that the whole country and most of the Congress was behind this plan.

They have not that comfort now. After 2 years of timid silence, the Old Guard has at last screwed up its courage to raise a voice from the tomb to send the shivers down their spines by beckoning to opposition and frustration of all that has been done for them. In Congress the despairing legions of reaction unfurl the old banners and, on the side lines, the savage orchestra of columnist and editorial kibitzers pound the tom-toms, burn the red fire, and shriek with demoniacal glee at every defection.

Now the thing that makes this possible is not a popular demand for a return to reaction. It is the exact reverse of that, and it has happened since last November. Two pied pipers have come to Hamelin Town—and you will recall what the pied piper was—a magician who, by tooting on a penny whistle, could step into the leadership of rats—or charm innocent children from the safety of their homes. But our two pipers are not concerned about rats. They are piping out of the city gates with more and more abused babies at their heels.

You can laugh at Father Coughlin, you can snort at HUEY LONG, but this country was never under a greater menace than from the break-up of spontaneous popular cooperation being engineered by the combination of this dangerous demagoguery with the direct assault of the old social Neanderthals—the architects of the 1929 boom or bust—and of our 5 black years of bitter bondage to despair. Peaceful recovery is being threatened with a grinding between the upper and the nether millstones of extreme group selfishness.

At this point I want to make it very clear that I am speaking for myself alone—a gratuitous volunteer. Nobody in the administration has been consulted about this speech, although I have advised on the project of making it with my best and wisest friends outside of government—"new dealers", "old dealers", and Coughlinites. It may interest you to know that, without one single exception, they advised against it. "If you want to hang yourself, go to it." Nothing did more to convince me that this speech had to be made. If demagoguery has reached the point where a man may risk his public standing by attacking it, it is time for somebody to get up on his hind legs and howl.

It does less than no good at all for an "old dealer" to howl. It is the greatest aid and comfort that could be given to the pied pipers. They can, and do, reply with perfect justice: "Nothing we could counsel this distressed people could do half the harm to them that your advice and leadership has already done."

No echo out of Wall Street, no radio program subsidized by big business, no slinging of the old stuff, is anything more than an affront to the people who suffer in this country. That stuff is like the cheese with which a little boy tried to feed a mouse imprisoned in a cheese-baited trap; that mouse didn't want any more cheese. That kind of answer to the pied pipers does as much to drive public opinion in their direction as their own piping does to persuade it.

I am well aware of what the pipers will say about me—that I am either drunk or crazy; that I once worked in New York myself and am a tool of the interests. Nerts to that! I never made a more deliberate speech. That I have rich friends is a fact. I also have poor friends. I am poor myself. But it just happens that I don't owe anybody anything; that I never got anything from anybody without paying for it; that I am on my own; and that I can rest on my record for saying just what I think whenever I feel

that it ought to be said and for taking all that's coming to me for saying it. And this time it will be plenty.

You don't see much in the newspapers about the piper pipers. The greatest force of this ilk is the radio, through which they can pollute our great popular pool of justified resentment. For want of work it sits idly before its receiving sets while there is pumped into it daily two ingredients—red pepper for its raw emotions and, for its hope, enticing promises of a money miracle, manna in this wilderness of despair—like the coriander seed, white, and the taste of it like wafers made with honey, of which he that gathereth much shall have nothing over, and he that gathereth little shall have no lack. That was said by Moses of a miracle performed in the desert of Sinai thousands of years ago; but it is the shortest, clearest statement of the money magic proffered by the pipers—he that gathereth much shall have nothing over, and he that gathereth little shall have no lack.

PLANS FOR ENDING POVERTY CALLED CRUEL DELUSIONS

Promise and performance possible only to the Lord God Almighty! To abolish poverty—oh, where have we heard that before? Easy magic offered by men who have no other wizardry than the charm of words and the awe of people for the robes they wear. They speak with nothing of learning, knowledge, nor experience to lead us through a labyrinth that has perplexed the minds of men since the beginning of time with no satisfactory solution and with no more authoritative comment than that of the Master—"the poor ye have with you always."

They ask us to go with them gayly down pathways by them called new, but that in truth have been trodden time and again in the world's history—but never to the rainbow's end they promise. In the many, many times that those paths have been taken since the world began, never once did they fail to lead to chaos and destruction, bearing always—first and most heavily—on the very class to which they now appeal.

Why, if these men know what they are talking about, their attempt to delude helpless, trusting sufferers to such a doom is unspeakable. If they do not know, then theirs is an act as rash and murderous as that of the tinker who tried a surgical operation on the human heart because he said that it was only a pump anyway and so entirely in his line of work.

It is not what these men say that is dangerous. It is the devilish ingenuity of their way of saying it. Put down on paper it doesn't make sense. "Every man a king" and "\$5,000 a year for everybody" would draw the proper "oh, yeah!" from 9 people out of 10, but it is no less ridiculous than "two cars in every garage" or "two chickens in every pot", which turned out to be two chickens in every garage—or the bunk with which Hitler took the hard-boiled Germans—and Hitler couldn't hold a candle to Huey in the art of the old Barnum ballyhoo—a new sucker every second!

"Ah'm not against de Constitution. Ah'm fo' de Constitution. Ah'm not against p'ivate p'op'ty. Ah'm fo' p'ivate p'op'ty. All mah plan says is 'tax 'em down', till nobody has mo' dan six million dollahs capital and one million dollahs income. Six million dollahs capital an' one million dollahs income is enough fo' any man!"

Can you beat it? There's language anybody can understand, and the tortured talk and \$4 words with which economists answer him is too much for about 99 percent of people, including myself. Who is going to dispute that six millions of capital and one million income is enough for any man? But try and get it!

Who is going to attempt to tell any man why he ought not to have \$5,000 a year, if Huey can get it for him—or even why he shouldn't be a king? The fact is that nobody is answering Huey in language anybody can understand. He's getting away with it without a contest. Added to that there comes burring over the air the dripping brogue of the Irish-Canadian priest—pounding home points of pure political propaganda by calling on the lives and sayings of all the saints and the very precepts of the Master in accents mellow with human sympathy—musical, blatant bunk from the very rostrum of religion—it goes straight home to simple souls weary in distress and defrauded in delay. And neither is anybody challenging him in language that means anything more to these people than a Gregorian chant intoned in Latin.

He wants to turn our banking system over to 48 petty politicians and authorize them to make money out of wind to pay the public debt and all expense of Government.

Why, to give every family \$5,000 a year income, the total income of the United States would have to be one hundred and fifty billions; and if some had a million and so on down to \$5,000 in the usual grades, as Huey proposes, it would have to be five hundred billions, which is more than 12 times as much as it is and more than 6 times as much as it has ever been. Huey says, "Divide our wealth", and he tells how to take it by taxes, but he never yet has told how to distribute it.

If you seized all property tomorrow by taxes and sold it at an auction tax sale, nobody would have enough to bid a tenth of its value. You would cut the price of America 90 percent, and nobody but a foreigner could buy it. When values bounced back, the few buyers would be fabulously rich and the rest of us unbelievably poor. Do you own anything? Huey is going to take it away from you and put it in a pool for division.

It is like the old darkey whom the Communist paraders persuaded to carry their banner by telling him that they were going to take everybody's money and divide it up equally. After marching a few blocks in ecstasy, he began to think and scratch his head. "How much do ev'body git?" he finally asked and was

told: "Seventeen dollars and twenty-seven cents." Said he: "Hyah—take yo' ol' red rag—ah got \$19.47 cents in mah britches right naow."

Nobody works or trades or manufactures except for profit or income. If you took that away by taxes you would stop activity, destroy employment, and pauperize this country. Huey could not distribute wealth that way, but he could distribute such poverty as the world has never seen and he knows that as well as anybody.

Father Coughlin's plan to make money out of nothing would make it worth nothing—and that would confiscate the wages of every worker, the savings of every family, and the life insurance of every widow. It would close up every endowed college, hospital, or other charitable institution in the country. It would cut off imports, forgive all foreign debts, and enable foreign nations with real money to buy our resources for a song. It would deliver every worker's work and every farmer's product to politics and, at one stroke, destroy the economic and political system of this country.

Stripped to the facts—and whether consciously or not—these two men are raging up and down this land preaching not construction but destruction—not reform but revolution—not peace but a sword. I think we are dealing with a couple of Catilines and that it is high time for somebody to say so.

This brings me to a part of this speech that I do not relish making. I like HUEY LONG. He is one of the most plausible punchinelloes in this or any other country. He is an able little devil and I can't help but gleefully admire his cast-iron cheek and his rough-and-tumble readiness to take on all comers, including the august Senate of the United States in session assembled.

For Father Coughlin I have even a closer sentiment. I agree with much that he says. I think he has done more to interest the average man in politics than anybody. At a very poignant moment in my life—my farewell to N. R. A.—just before it went under the ether and had its intestines removed and wrapped up in a warm wet towel, he sent me a message that touched my heart: "My dear General, I joyed with you and wept with you during your discourse this afternoon. You have served your country and its citizens more courageously than we dare express at the present moment. That man who attempts to do a public service as wholeheartedly and as honestly as you have done is a fool if he hopes to escape the vinegar or calumny and the thorns of grief. God bless you."

I have my full share of the common failing, and that warm message makes it very hard for me to say what I know must be said. I am sure that Father Coughlin is sincere, but I know he is misguided.

SINCERE REVOLUTIONARY TERMED MOST DANGEROUS

The most dangerous revolutionary in the world is the sincere one—the more sincere the more dangerous. Also, in this country, at least, it is the opinion and not the garb or station of the man who holds it that counts. White or black—baker, butcher, or candlestick maker—every man has a right to his say regardless. But I think there is an exception to the rule when it applies to revolutionary propaganda in the mouth of a priest of the Roman Catholic Church.

The Founder of Christianity likened the church to a net holding good and bad fish. From recent Popes have come documents on social justice unsurpassed by the mind of man. But the church has also included in its net some of the greatest social despots in history—the very bad fish. A principal architect of the French Revolution and the Red Terror was Charles Maurice de Talleyrand-Perigord, Roman Catholic bishop of Autun—a crook and a grafter who served all masters of every stripe from the old Bourbons through the revolution to Napoleon and back again to Bourbons. Nothing in the priestly fellowship prevented him from carrying out the red doctrines of anti-Christ and sending his old friends and consecrated men of his own cloth to the guillotine by the score.

While I do not for a moment compare Father Coughlin with Talleyrand, it is no exaggeration to say that, through the doorway of his priestly office, covered in his designs by the sanctity of the robe he wears, Father Coughlin, by the cheap strategy of appealing to the envy of those who have nothing for those who have something, has become active political head of an active political party. That party might better be known as the "national revolutionary party", although it has the more tripping title of the National Union for Social Justice, and I think that makes him another bad fish in the net of the Holy Church.

Of recent months there has been an open alliance between the great Louisiana demagogue and this political padre, who does not arraign our President and our institutions in the American language without a Canadian accent, and who may or may not now be an American citizen, but certainly once was not. On a recent Sunday Father Coughlin announced at the conclusion of a sermon on money and politics, which contained a direct attack on the President of the United States, that his topic would be taken up later in the evening by a distinguished Senator; and, sure enough, across the evening air, replacing the good father's melodious burring, came the canebrake drawl of HUEY LONG, expounding that priestly and saintly discourse; and the first voice that Huey heard when he gave up the microphone was that of Father Coughlin's congratulating him.

These two patriots may have been reading last summer's lurid story about an American Hitler riding into Washington at the head of troops. That would be definite to Huey because he knows what part of the horse he can be, but we have a right to object most vigorously to the sanctification of such a centaur by having the

head wear the collar of Rome and come intoning the stately measures of the church in pious benediction on such an unholy monstrosity.

TELLS OF CATHOLICS' AID IN BEGINNING OF N. R. A.

I respect all denominations and all true worshippers. I have the deepest regard for the Catholic Church and the Catholic priesthood. I know something of both their valor and their unvarying patriotism during the war. In the trying beginnings of N. R. A. I had no more enthusiastic cooperation and devoted support than I got from bishops, priests, and professors of Catholic institutions. To insure that the wisdom of this age-old church be brought to the solution of our problems, I secured the appointment on the Little Review Board of Monsignor John Ryan, our foremost Catholic economist. The good Fathers of Georgetown University helped me work out the mechanics of the draft in 1917. Father Haas has served devotedly on the Labor Advisory Board of N. R. A. from the beginning—a kindly man whose very companionship is a benediction. Throughout my life I have had warm friends in that priesthood who will bear with me, I am sure, when I say that I think we have here a prostitution of their holy office, a violation of vows, and a degradation of the teachings of Jesus Christ.

Why, I have heard the very sayings of the Lord brought forward to bring a religious odor to a proposition for fiat money, and the holy mercy of St. Veronica, who wiped the blood and sweat from the suffering Savior's face, invoked in an emotional appeal to all women to support a silly and unfair attack on the President and a bill in Congress for a political banking system.

Jesus said, "Bring me a penny, that I may see it." And they brought it. And He sayeth unto them, "Whose is this image and superscription?" And then they said unto Him, "Caesar's." And Jesus answered, saying, "Render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and to God the things that are God's."

ASSAILS INVESTMENT OF COUGHLIN LEAGUE

But Father Coughlin has no such indifference to pennies. I was for him at the beginning, heart and soul, and I had been told that, as a Canadian citizen, he was a member of the Basilian Order and vowed to poverty. When I heard about a year ago that his private corporation, the Radio League of the Little Flower, was interested in the silver of which he was preaching monetization, I gave the lie to that statement. When the official list was published by the Treasury Department, I saw that I had been wrong.

From the day of the publication of that list the good Father has become the bitter enemy of President Roosevelt's administration. Now I don't question the right of any man to invest money as he will, but when a priest vowed to poverty and preaching to the poor flays the faith of a people to advance a monetary interest—his own or another—you can about conclude that Judas Iscariot was just a poor piker. He sold out the Hope of the World for 30 pieces of silver, when today he might have bartered 50,000 ounces on so small a thing as abuse of the trust of a national congregation.

In 1928 Al Smith, whom I revere as a truly great American, went from coast to coast proudly declaring that the Catholic Church and priesthood kept out of politics. He was sincere and he was right. I was in that fight and I marveled at the restraint of Catholic priests. Reviled and dishonored by political mudslingers, they kept the silent tenor of their way. Al could not make that proud boast today, and that is a very great shame. I spoke my mind at Waterloo, Iowa, last year on Hitler's sadistic persecution of the Jews, and I feel just as strongly against the persecution of Catholics in Mexico, which is excused by their tormentors on the charge that priests play politics with a people's faith.

But if this thing spreads in this country there may well be a persecution here—not on the faith of a denomination but on the abuse of the clerical office by schemers using the cloak of religion to seek political power, and especially when they bend religious faith to the uses of sedition. If religion means nothing more than the remonetization of silver and the promotion of a revolutionary political group, then we can get along without it. We can't get along without it. Here, as at few times in our history, are wounded hearts seeking the solace of the mercy seat. Nothing is more needed among us than a spiritual return to the faith of our fathers. The Catholic Church was born of a great depression and had its first spread among the distressed and down-trodden people of the Mediterranean. God knows there is distress enough today. There is work aplenty for a priest and—it may be—in driving the money changers from the temple, but certainly not in usurping their abandoned tables with another sanctified shell game and a new flock of doves.

We can respect as a political agitator Mr. Coughlin voicing any opinion that he may hold. Or we can revere as a most eloquent preacher of a great church Father Coughlin urging any tenet of his faith. But we can neither respect nor revere what appears to be a priest in holy orders entering our homes with the open sesame of his high calling and there, in the name of Jesus Christ, demanding that we ditch the President for HUEY LONG, bastardize our American system, and destroy the Government of our country.

The ridiculous rumor is rife that Father Coughlin is the agent of the Pope in trying to upset this Protestant country in the interests of the church of Rome. Nothing could be more absurd; and yet it is perfectly plain that either the church or Father Coughlin should promptly sever his revolutionary political activities from his priestly office. We expect politics to make strange bedfellows, but if Father Coughlin wants to engage in political bundling with

HUEY LONG or any other demagogue, it is only a fair first move to take off his Roman cassock.

At least there is no such running with the hare and hunting with the hounds about his little playmate, HUEY LONG. You know just where he stands and how, given power, he will act; because you know how he has acted in the State of Louisiana. There Huey is a dictator by force of arms, and Adolph Hitler has nothing on him any way you care to look at them both. In fact, Huey is the Hitler of one of our sovereign States—not in the forcible seizure of absolute and arbitrary powers alone, but in the curious mixture of incredible mumbo-jumbo, the surface plausibility and undoubted personal magnetism that cause people to put their emotions before their reason and go stampeding off to nothing like a frightened flock of sheep.

Between the team of Huey and the priest we have the whole bag of crazy or crafty tricks possessed by any Mad Mullah or dancing dervish who ever incited a tribe or people through illusion to its doom—Peter the Hermit, Napoleon Bonaparte, Sitting Bull, William Hohenzollern, the Mahdi of the Soudan, Hitler, Lenin, Trotsky, and the Leatherstocking God—here they are, all boiled down to two, with the radio and the news reels to make them effective; and if you don't believe they are dangerous you just haven't thought much about it or you don't know the temper of this country in this continued moment of distress.

What are we going to do about it? There is just one thing to do and that is to finish what we started and give Democratic leadership adjusted to crisis a fair chance.

That goes for everybody. It goes for industry, which just 2 years ago was wrecked and seeking salvage in a dictator and which at last feels the thrill of life along its keel. It should be in Washington again, not obstructing but asking what it can do to help. It goes for labor, which, however disappointed by some it trusted, ought not to grouse at an administration which has gone with it nine times out of ten because it has not received the uttermost farthing. It goes for agriculture, which has been lifted further out of the hole than anybody thought possible 2 years ago and which owes every inch of gain directly to administration measures.

It goes for finance which, instead of sitting back and saying that nothing is possible under new laws, ought to come forward with some practical suggestion for amendment that would effectively abolish abuses (which this country will never again permit) and yet relieve the present paralysis of trading. It goes for the unemployed and those burdened with debt and losses who have been taken care of more effectively than ever before in the history of this or any other country and who ought to carry on patiently for just a little longer and tell the Father Longs and Huey Coughlins—or whatever it is—that they are taking their religion from their church and their political leadership from their statesmen and that they are not in the market for any shoes made by a milliner or hats by a cobbler or magic financial hair tonic put up by partnership of a priest and punchinello guaranteed to grow economic whiskers on a billiard ball overnight.

Let us take our benefits with our burdens—the bitter with the sweet—and, keeping our feet on the middle path between those two mad extremes, let us try to restore to this country something of the faith and spontaneous cooperation of a free people that led the whole world in the Great War from the darkness of disaster and defeat to the sudden glory of complete victory and that started us so hopefully on our path to prosperity in 1933.

No two of us agree about everything, and I by no means concur in all that the President has done. But I think our sole hope lies in him; I believe that we are still in deadly danger. I regard as traitors to our common cause all those who are unable or unwilling to accept each situation as we find it, whether created by a success or a failure—a bullseye or a complete miss—and, after urging their opinion as vehemently and as vigorously as they will, fail to accept the verdict of the polls, but jog or try to break the elbow of our pilot in this sea of shoals.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, the Senate and the galleries have just witnessed a demonstration. Egotism, arrogance, and ignorance are seldom displayed in the Senate of the United States. They require a measure of talent possessed only by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG]. His concluding remark was a warning to me lest I be not much longer here.

Ladies and gentlemen in the galleries, to whom the Senator from Louisiana always addresses his remarks, it is perhaps a matter of very little concern to the country, to its future, to its welfare, whether either the Senator from Louisiana or the Senator from Arkansas much longer remains here.

I wonder how the Senator from Louisiana thinks he acquires the right to tell Senators, representatives of sovereign States, that they can serve here only by his leave. I wish to say now with all the emphasis at my command, and with all the amusement which the subject justifies, that whenever I have to serve in the United States Senate or anywhere else with the leave or approval of the Senator from Louisiana I will be glad to go back to the shades of oblivion from which he and I both have come.

Mr. President, it ill becomes a Member of this body to attempt to bulldoze his fellow Senators. Our debates here ought to proceed on reason and argument; but I am speaking now to those who have witnessed the performances in this body, repeated time and time again, of the Senator from Louisiana, who assumes to tell Senators when they can serve in this body. I am speaking to those who are familiar with his performances and know that his tactics are to take the floor, where his remarks are privileged, and assail persons who do not belong to the Senate and who have no opportunity of replying to him.

I am perfectly content that General Johnson and the Senator from Louisiana may have their fight out in any form they choose. I think it would be rather in good taste, in view of the opinions of each other which they have expressed, if they should use the good old-fashioned way of settling personal controversies, rather than bringing them into the Senate of the United States, and imposing on this body and on our guests the task, the difficult and disagreeable task, of listening to things which might just as well not be said anywhere, much less in a body like the Senate of the United States.

Mr. President, the Senator from Louisiana undertook to reply to General Johnson. I heard General Johnson's speech last night, and probably other Senators did, and I am prepared to say that, in my opinion, the Senator from Louisiana thundered in the index; he failed to reply to General Johnson.

The Senator from Louisiana chose to make an attack on Mr. Bernard M. Baruch; and what was the point of the attack? If I can correctly summarize it, it was to the effect that in some mysterious way Mr. Baruch has been controlling the last three Presidential administrations, and that in the control he has demonstrated a sinister purpose.

The Senator from Louisiana quoted statements from Mr. Baruch, most of which, in my humble judgment, are based on sound principles of economics, not "Long" economics, not economics of the character promulgated by the Senator from Louisiana, but economics as we know it in the textbooks and as we know it in our own thoughts. For instance, he seemingly, by implication, denounced Mr. Baruch for the statement that German reparations should be fixed in a definite amount. I recall that during the peace conference at Paris one of the great problems there was the settlement of reparations.

It is true that Mr. Baruch did insist upon the definite fixing of reparations, and now I undertake to say, in view of all that has happened since, in view of all the disagreements which have arisen respecting this subject, that if the peace conference had pursued that course, and had stated definitely the amount which Germany must pay, the consequences of the failure to fix the amount would have been escaped, and not only Germany but every other nation in the world would have been in a better economic condition today than that in which it now finds itself, by reason of pursuing the course which Mr. Baruch recommended, and which the Senator from Louisiana condemns as being absurd and unsound. The other course was taken. An unlimited amount was required to be paid. The more that was paid the more that would have to be paid, so that with the passing of years the problem of reparations gathered volume and gathered force, and it resulted in ruptures, and in the perpetuation of animosities that might very well have been terminated if the sound and sensible policy of fixing the amount had been agreed on in the Versailles conference.

Other statements were made. We all know that the declaration that Mr. Baruch has been running the last three administrations and is running the present administration is another evidence of the inaccuracy of thought and speech on the part of the Senator from Louisiana. It is my information that Mr. Baruch has never sought to impose his views on any President; that when he has acted he has acted at the solicitation and request of the head of the Government, and when his services to this Government and our people are compared with the services of the Senator from Louisi-

ana to the people of his State and the people of this Nation the Senator from Louisiana will have some reason to diminish the arrogance and the insolence of his assertions here.

During the World War, when every resource was being mobilized and every power was being exerted for the successful conduct of the conflict, Mr. Baruch served as the head of the War Industries Board. It is the consensus of opinion on the part of those who know the subject and who are willing to be fair about it that he rendered a service without compensation and at great sacrifice which entitled him to the respect and confidence of the people of this Nation and of the world.

But the Senator from Louisiana could not answer General Johnson. He found superiority in the use of irony and sarcasm and in the employment of queer appellations by the former head of the National Industrial Recovery Administration, and so instead of making a reply, he rants and rages and attacks somebody else. I appeal to this audience: What thought did he leave in your mind except that there was something mysteriously sinister in the character and conduct of General Johnson?

It is regrettable that this should be the forum for the display of such disposition as the Senator from Louisiana has exemplified in this body today. I do not know what his end will be. I do not give him warning. It would do no good. I do not tell him that if he attempts to promote his own personal ambition by the denunciation in his addresses of those to whom he owes allegiance by the attempt, often repeated, to discredit men far greater and much better than he has ever been or ever can be, he may come to the end which he prophesies for others.

What right has the Senator from Louisiana to denounce his former friend, the President of the United States, in language like that which he employed today? Does he not know that Franklin De-la-no Roosevelt, as he said, is bearing a burden sufficient in its weight and magnitude to crush the greatest soul? Does he not know that in his position as President of the United States Mr. Roosevelt has attracted to himself the confidence of the people of this Nation—not that they all believe that his plans are all the wisest that could be formed, but that they all recognize the fact that in his great heart the President is anxious to do everything possible to promote the ends and aims of national recovery.

Yes; the Senator from Louisiana ridicules what has been done by the administration; in fact, he ridicules everything that is proposed by anybody but himself. He scoffs and scorns the Civilian Conservation Corps, ridicules the plan under which young men who are out of employment are given the opportunity to perform useful toil for limited compensation. Yet, Mr. President, I doubt if there is another Senator here who would say that tomorrow, if he had the power, he would turn the young men now in the civilian conservation camps out to find their way alone through a benighted world.

I meet without apology the issue raised by the Senator from Louisiana. What would have been the fate of this valuable asset in our population—the hundreds of thousands of young men who have been engaged in the conservation camps? Should they have been left as dependents upon parents who were unable to provide for themselves? Should they have been encouraged to become tramps? Should they have been invited into the seductive but dangerous paths of vice which were open to them?

When the Senator from Louisiana ridicules the President's efforts to redeem and save this asset of incalculable value—and what can be more valuable than the young, the enlightened manhood of the United States?—I ask him: Has he no sense of responsibility when he speaks? Has he no power to look into the future, except with the hope of arousing hatred, animosity, and wants that he knows cannot be supplied?

Month after month the Senator from Louisiana has disgusted this body with repeated attacks upon men who are superior to him, with repeated efforts to discredit the Presi-

dent and humiliate him; and now it is about time that the manhood in the Senate should assert itself. [Manifestations of applause.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER rapped with his gavel.

Mr. ROBINSON. It is about time that he should be made to know and take his proper place in a body composed for the most part of gentlemen.

Innuendoes, insinuations, and threats cannot prevail in the Senate of the United States, unless we have descended to the level of mediocre degenerates!

I have spoken earnestly, and I realize that there are those who are listening to me who will say, "Why pay attention to the ravings of one who anywhere else than in the Senate would be called a madman?"

I thank the Senate for the patience and the attention with which it has heard me.

GEN. RICHARD P. WILLIAMS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the nomination of Richard P. Williams to be brigadier general, Marine Corps.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Richard P. Williams to be brigadier general in the Marine Corps?

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, as I observe the Chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs is not present, I suggest the presence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Adams	Copeland	Keyes	Radcliffe
Ashurst	Costigan	King	Reynolds
Austin	Couzens	La Follette	Robinson
Bachman	Cutting	Logan	Russell
Bailey	Dickinson	Loneragan	Schall
Bankhead	Dieterich	Long	Schwellenbach
Barbour	Donahay	McAdoo	Sheppard
Bilbo	Duffy	McCarran	Shipstead
Black	Fletcher	McGill	Smith
Bone	Frazier	McKellar	Stetson
Borah	George	McNary	Thomas, Okla.
Brown	Gerry	Maloney	Thomas, Utah
Bulkeley	Gibson	Minton	Townsend
Bulow	Glass	Moore	Trammell
Burke	Gore	Murphy	Truman
Byrd	Guffey	Murray	Tydings
Byrnes	Hale	Neely	Vandenberg
Capper	Harrison	Norbeck	Van Nuys
Carey	Hastings	Norris	Wagner
Clark	Hatch	Nye	Walsh
Connally	Hayden	O'Mahoney	Wheeler
Coolidge	Johnson	Pope	White

Mr. DIETERICH. I wish to announce that my colleague, the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS], is necessarily detained from the Senate.

Mr. ROBINSON. I announce that my colleague, the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY], and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], are absent because of illness; and that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN] are necessarily detained from the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-eight Senators having answered to the roll call, a quorum is present. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Richard P. Williams to be brigadier general in the Marine Corps? [Putting the question.] The "ayes" have it, and the nomination is confirmed.

GEN. JOHN H. RUSSELL

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of John H. Russell to be major general in the Marine Corps?

Mr. BLACK. I move that the nomination be recommitted to the Committee on Naval Affairs for further and more complete investigation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. TRAMMELL. Mr. President, I have to oppose the motion in view of the fact that for some 3 or 4 weeks at different hearings the criticisms which have been made in the Senate were investigated as best they could be investigated by the committee and there was practically no evidence whatever to substantiate the criticisms and allega-

tions which have been made here and which in large degree were made also before the committee. I do not see any use in continuing to hold up a question of this character merely upon hearsay and upon prejudiced statements emanating, at least, from persons who have been disappointed because of not securing promotions. That has been almost entirely the source of the contention and the criticism of General Russell.

I will not weary the Senate by going into all the details; but it has been said that the selection board was a one-man board. Regardless of what kind of a board it was, the fact remains that it was the character of board which had been authorized and created by Congress. General Russell was not responsible for the board; but, as a matter of fact, the board in its set-up under the law is a great improvement over the old system. The old system provided for promotion by seniority within a class. If there were 10 officers of the senior class of equal length of service the Commandant himself would recommend to the Secretary of the Navy the one who should be selected, and then the Secretary of the Navy, and on to the President. In consequence, under the old system the Commandant himself had every opportunity possible, as one man, to control who should be the officer selected within the senior class, subject, of course, to the President's approval.

The present system was inaugurated, first being recommended by General Lejeune and adopted by Congress. The law sets up the board. What is called the senior board has 6 members while the junior board has 9 members. General Russell favored this method. If General Russell had wanted to carry on a one-man promotion board, why would he have recommended the law which created a board of 6 and a board of 9, respectively? However, he did recommend it and supported the law. If the law is wrong, we should like to have something better. I have not heard of any suggestions of any better plan than that which is now in operation.

I will repeat in this connection that every Senator will realize it does not make any difference what character of board may be created or what character of plan may be instituted for selecting officers for promotion, some of those at least who are not promoted will be dissatisfied and some of them will criticize. We meet with that situation in every avenue of life—the disappointed criticize. So criticism has been directed more against the board than against any individual.

So far as the question of the board being dominated by General Russell is concerned, there is not one particle of evidence which has come before the committee or anybody else to indicate that he directed and dominated the board. There were six members of the board. There were only 11 eligible for membership upon the board. The first board which he recommended took 6 of those who were eligible, and in the second instance, when another board was appointed 6 months later, 4 out of the 6 men were not on the previous board, resulting in the course of 6 months in the case of the two boards of 10 out of the 11 eligibles serving on the board. There is nothing about that to indicate or even suggest to a fair mind that General Russell was trying to pack the board, and there is no evidence to that effect. It is just merely a question of the tactics adopted by those who were dissatisfied and who would criticize. I do not mean all the officers are inclined that way, for I have not heard of any general dissatisfaction among the officers; I have not heard of any reign of terror. I have heard, however, of a tempest in a teapot, and that is about what we have been having here because boards have been going ahead and doing their duty as they should, and there is no evidence to show discrimination or unfairness, but a few are dissatisfied and criticize. Of course, I wish means could be devised to prevent people from criticizing if they do not like everything we do, but I have not heard of that kind of a prescription that could be availed of. It would not work in regard to promotion boards in the Marine Corps.

General Russell stated, and it has not been contradicted, that all he did was to vote as a member of the board. He did not try to dominate the board, and no one has intimated

that he did. The board had practically a secret ballot. He states that some officers for whom he voted for promotion were not promoted. If he had dominated the board it would seem he could have had them all promoted.

I am taking the position I do and the committee took the position it did because there is no evidence to show there has been anything of an unfair nature or any discrimination in the action of the board. I have heard it stated that General Russell was a member of the board which promoted himself. That is untrue. There is nothing to it whatever. Most of the criticism has been baseless and absolutely without foundation or support.

Senators talk about doing justice, but we cannot promote 18 officers when there are only 2 promotions to be made. If anyone has a recipe whereby that can be done, I should like to have it, because occasionally I have a public position or two to fill—I do not get many—and a thousand people want three positions. If there is any way to give the three positions and still keep the remaining 997 applicants from being dissatisfied, I should like to know about it. The officers who were members of this board were in that situation.

We have not gone into the question of the Haitian situation again because it was taken up some 15 months ago when President Roosevelt nominated General Russell to be Commandant of the Marines. It was more or less of an issue at that time. Before the President submitted the nomination, objection to General Russell was made before the committee on account of the Haitian incident. We went into it quite thoroughly at that time and concluded there was nothing to indicate in any way that we should not recommend his confirmation. We did so, and the Senate confirmed his nomination to be Commandant of the Marine Corps.

The issue seems to be whether or not General Russell was dominating and controlling and in command of the situation. A question has arisen in regard to the record. I stated yesterday, and General Russell himself has stated, that he was not the one who issued the order, that he was not responsible for it, but that it was handled through the State Department. We did not have the records before us then, but we have the records now. These records are considered always as confidential, but any Senator may see them.

The records do not disclose that General Russell was dominating the situation, but, to the contrary, that both the State Department and General Russell endeavored to get the President of Haiti not to issue the order. When the issue came as to who had authority, the State Department advised the Minister of Haiti that while they preferred that the action to exclude the Senator be not taken, yet Haiti was a sovereign state and had control over its internal affairs, and the United States should not interfere with its control of the situation.

President Borno issued an order. The record would indicate that prior to that time General Russell had tried to persuade him not to do it. Of course, it is said by some that General Russell controlled and dominated President Borno and that he was responsible for the issuance of the order, but there is no evidence to that effect, and the records from the State Department indicate that he tried to persuade President Borno not to issue the order.

After the order was issued the Chief of the Army, as he might be called, issued orders in regard to the presidential order which had been made by President Borno, and General Russell was asked what should be done. General Russell replied—and that is the only way he came to be in any way connected with the order, which was not his order at all—that they should be governed by article XI of the treaty. Article XI of the treaty provided in substance, as the State Department had advised General Russell and the Haitian Government, that matters of that character were under the control of the Haitian President, and that the Haitian Army was under control of the Haitian President. That is all General Russell did. He did not issue any order. He had nothing to do with issuing any order, but when asked about it he gave the information which had been

given to him by the State Department, and the substance of that was that the matter was under the control of the Haitian Government, and not under the control of the United States. That is about all there is to the Haitian incident.

I feel, in justice to the committee, that this statement with reference to the Haitian incident should be made. We have all the State Department records, which they want returned, and I am sure I have given a fair statement of the contents of those records. They have been exhibited to some Senators and will be exhibited to any other Senator who desires to see them.

The question of how many Mexican soldiers were at the water works is a matter worthy of no further discussion. If General Russell made a mistake about that, he is not to be criticized for it. He had been strictly warned and ordered not to take any aggressive action. General Funston, who was in charge, had so warned him, and the records so disclose. He was complimented upon his service there by those in authority.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMAS of Utah in the chair). Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. TRAMMELL. I yield.

Mr. BLACK. May I ask where is the record that shows he was complimented?

Mr. TRAMMELL. I think we have extracts from General Funston's orders.

Mr. BLACK. I should like to hear read anything from General Funston congratulating General Russell. I have never seen it. I have the report from General Funston which was sent to me. I have never seen any statement anywhere that commended General Russell for his action except that he himself testified that General Funston complimented him personally. If it is there, I am asking to have it read.

Mr. TRAMMELL. I do not know that it contains a specific commendation, but there is no criticism of General Russell. The record makes reference to the incident and reports the best information they could get in regard to it. Of course, there is a difference in the statement made by one person on hearsay evidence and the statement made by General Taylor, but whether or not there were 100 men or 150 or 500 men or 1 man bearing a flag of truce, those in charge of the administration in no wise criticized General Russell. He was acting under the strictest orders to take no aggressive steps. If he had gone out and carried on anything like an offensive campaign, had gotten into an engagement, there is a probability he would have been court-martialed for violating orders and instructions not to take any aggressive action.

Of course, there might have been a thousand men there, but I would rather believe the statement of the outpost who actually had observation of the situation and knew what was going on than I would the statement of somebody who has set himself up as a general critic of General Russell. He stated there was a company of men there and that he saw at least 120 to 150, and that he thought there were more around the bend of the road, hidden by the brush there.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. TRAMMELL. Certainly.

Mr. BLACK. I have a letter written with a pen by the outpost, dated March 2, which states there were no troops there except one man.

Mr. TRAMMELL. Who is he?

Mr. BLACK. James M. Votta. He was the bugler who went out searching for the rebels.

Mr. TRAMMELL. It depends upon when he went to search.

Mr. BLACK. He is the one they sent out. He is the one who went out in the beginning. He is the one that Colonel Clarke said he had with him as a bugler.

Mr. TRAMMELL. I would rather take the statement of Colonel Clarke in regard to that. Is this man a critic?

Mr. BLACK. Is he a critic?

Mr. TRAMMELL. Yes.

Mr. BLACK. He just read an editorial about the statement and wrote this letter to say that he was there, and that there were no Mexicans there.

Mr. TRAMMELL. Colonel Clarke says he was there, and he is the one who sent the bugler out, and that he did see the Mexican soldiers, 120 or 130 at least, from his own observation, and he thought there were more; that the courier from the Mexicans did come forward, and that when General Russell refused their demands—as, of course, he did—the courier returned, and that they fired a few shots, and he saw no more of them.

I am not going to set myself up as a military critic or a military expert on questions of tactics or policies and try to condemn an officer on account of an incident of that character, which, even if established by competent evidence, does not disclose that General Russell did wrong by taking an aggressive stand and rushing out there and carrying on a battle against the instructions of his superior, General Funston, and also the State Department, the administration. We were trying to be very cautious in Haiti. We can recall that as a matter of common information, and through the proper channels, instructions to that effect had been issued.

Mr. President, I am going to take only a few moments longer. We have investigated the different criticisms in regard to General Russell. We have not found facts supporting any of the criticisms. I have never been in favor of condemning a person, or withholding from a person something to which he was entitled and which he had merited by a high class of service, merely upon unsupported criticism and hearsay evidence. I do not take seriously, in the first instance, criticism based upon dissatisfaction on the part of somebody who did not happen to be successful when it was impossible for everybody to be successful in the particular transaction, and when those who have been dissatisfied have disclosed no evidence. No evidence has been developed that General Russell has not served in his command well, and that he has not been fair and just.

I cannot quite understand how a man, for instance, could have the commendation of three different Secretaries of State—Secretary Hughes, now the esteemed Chief Justice of the United States; Mr. Kellogg; and Mr. Stimson—and also the President of the United States at that time, and the strong commendation of General Lejeune, who was then the Commandant of the Marine Corps, upon his service in Haiti, and how he could have gotten promotions from time to time if he had not rendered a faithful and capable character of service as an officer of the Marine Corps. I am not willing to take away from him the standing which he has won, the position which he has occupied, the promotion which he has received, merely upon hearsay evidence and upon criticism.

Of course, there are a good many officers who did not get promotions. My friend the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BLACK] talked about officers who did not get promotions, about fighting men who did not get promotions. If Congress thinks we should have a Marine Corps or an Army composed of 20,000 officers and about 2,000 men—that is putting it in an exaggerated way, but it emphasizes the situation—of course, we can promote all the officers. There are, however, only a certain number of officers for a certain number of privates. Congress authorizes so many enlisted men, and they cannot have 40 colonels and 35 generals when the Congress itself has restricted the number of enlisted men.

If we should do that sort of thing, instead of having an Army of enlisted men, we would have an Army of colonels and generals and majors and captains. It would be about like the condition a young fellow told me of following the war. He was very anxious to get out of the service. He and others were anxious to get in while the fighting was going on, and after the armistice they wanted to get out. He was stationed at one of the camps—I do not remember where—and he importuned me to help him get out of the service. He had been fighting, and had done all he could for his country, and after the fighting was over he wanted to go home; and he said, "The trouble is, they have about 45 officers down there and they have only about 60 or 70

men. Of course, it is very difficult for us to get out, with 45 officers and only about 60 or 70 privates."

He was right about that, so far as I know. I do not know anything about the facts; but certainly Congress does not want to take the attitude that every officer should be promoted and that the Marine Corps should be topheavy with officers, and that our Army should be topheavy with officers, and that our Navy should be topheavy with officers. So it is just a question of not being able to promote them all.

I have heard General Russell say that there were a number of splendid officers whom he would have been glad to see promoted, but he could not promote them all. The law allowed only so many officers, so they could not promote 18 officers who were eligible when the law allowed only 2 to be promoted. That is the situation. That is the system. If Congress wants to change that system so that every time an officer wants a promotion he shall have a promotion, it will be necessary to take in more and more officers in the lower rank until we have a Marine Corps composed more of officers than of enlisted men.

Of course, Congress can do that if it desires. Congress heretofore has taken the other attitude, and that is the law at the present time. General Russell has nothing to do with the law. General Russell has nothing to do with the formation of the board so far as the law is concerned. That is prescribed by an act of Congress; and it certainly is a great improvement over the old system, under which the Commandant and the Secretary of the Navy practically absolutely controlled who should be promoted within the senior class.

Mr. President, I could go into a great many other details, but I feel that that is not essential. The committee was firmly convinced that General Russell should not be denied this promotion, which has been recommended to the Senate by the President; and I hope the motion to recommit the nomination will not be adopted. The committee has been considering the nomination for 3 or 4 or 5 weeks; and, as I have already stated, we have not found one scintilla of evidence that supports these criticisms and these rumors, and "they said", and "I heard." That is about as much evidence as we ever had about any of these charges—"I heard", or "they said."

I hope the Senate will confirm the nomination.

MY VOICE WILL NOT BE CHANGED WHILE PEOPLE SUFFER

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I ask to have the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] sent for.

I could not stay in the Chamber during his remarks. I would have continued my remarks for some further minutes, except that I was not able to continue at the time. I was forced to leave the Chamber. Therefore I could not be here when the Senator from Arkansas made his remarks.

I have not heard the Senator, nor have I read his remarks; but my secretary, who sat in the gallery, took down some of his remarks and read them over to me rather hastily, so I thought I would return to the Chamber. I have sent for the Senator from Arkansas. He left the Chamber some minutes ago. I presume he will be back, and I prefer not to go too heavily into remarks that might touch him before he returns.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG. Yes, sir; I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Adams	Burke	Duffy	Johnson
Ashurst	Byrd	Fletcher	Keyes
Austin	Byrnes	Frazier	King
Bachman	Capper	George	La Follette
Bailey	Carey	Gerry	Logan
Bankhead	Clark	Gibson	Lonergan
Barbour	Connally	Glass	Long
Bilbo	Coolidge	Gore	McAdoo
Black	Copeland	Guffey	McCarran
Bone	Couzens	Hale	McGill
Borah	Cutting	Harrison	McKellar
Brown	Dickinson	Hastings	McNary
Bulkeley	Dieterich	Hatch	Maloney
Bulow	Donahey	Hayden	Minton

Moore	Pope	Shipstead	Tydings
Murphy	Radcliffe	Smith	Vandenberg
Murray	Reynolds	Steiner	Van Nuys
Nally	Robinson	Thomas, Okla.	Wagner
Norbeck	Russell	Thomas, Utah	Walsh
Norris	Schall	Townsend	Wheeler
Nye	Schwellenbach	Trammell	White
O'Mahoney	Sheppard	Truman	

Mr. DIETERICH. I wish to announce that my colleague the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS] is necessarily detained from the Senate.

Mr. ROBINSON. I desire to announce that the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] and the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY] are detained by illness.

I wish also to announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN], and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. COSTIGAN] are necessarily detained.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-seven Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I repeat, I was not able to remain in the Chamber long enough to complete as much of my speech as I wished to deliver, nor was I able to stay here while the Senator from Arkansas spoke. But I was furnished by my secretary, who has the good fortune also to be a stenographer, some of the notes, which he translated to me orally, of some of the remarks made by the Senator from Arkansas in my absence.

Mr. President, I have never made any personal reflections on the Senator from Arkansas on this floor. I have read things the Senator published himself; I do not know that that would be taken as a reflection on him. I recall no time when I have breached the rules of the Senate as the Senator from Arkansas has, according to what has been supplied to me by my secretary, in his reflections this afternoon.

I do not take any offense at that, however. I am a politician, and I have heard of these things said so many times on the hustings by political opponents that I never take offense. I just want the Senate to note, however, that I do not violate the rules of the Senate, but the Senator from Arkansas takes unto himself that privilege.

He quite often interferes in the debates in which I have been engaged, never addressing the Chair, but rising and making his points without asking anyone whether or not he cares to yield. The RECORD is full of that. I have never objected to it. I only return now in order that I may clear up whatever may have been said by the Senator.

I now have the official transcript of the remarks the Senator made. It seems that the Senator from Arkansas took offense because I sounded a friendly word of warning. I was careful to stay within the rules and precedents. I merely sounded a word of warning uttered by a colleague here last year. I undertook to do that in a gentlemanly way. What I said about Mr. Baruch was written by Mr. Baruch, and only commented upon within the confines of fair and regular conclusions.

Of course, I know the Senator from Arkansas is an admirer of Mr. Baruch. He has said so from this floor, I think, many times, and the Senator from Arkansas has a right to be an admirer of Mr. Baruch. The Senator from Arkansas was championing things here which Baruch was championing for Hoover, or which Hoover was championing for Baruch, when I was opposed to them. That is his right; that is only natural.

The Senator has always been kind to Presidents. That is a good way to be. Presidents have always been kind to the Senator, and that is a good way to be. I only regret that I have not had convictions which enabled me to be so kind to Presidents that Presidents would have been kind to me. It all goes in the course of a lifetime.

Naturally, I regret that the Senator sees fit to refer to me as being ignorant, egotistical, and arrogant, which expressions I understand he used. I understand he also criticized what HUEY LONG stands for.

Mr. President, the Senator and I live neighbors. The Senator has been criticizing Louisiana ever since I have been back. I wish to compare Louisiana and Arkansas.

It is awfully bad to have a Long adherent running Louisiana, but it is not very bad to have a Robinson adherent running Arkansas. I have a friend in the Governor's office in Louisiana for whom I voted and whom I supported, and the Senator from Arkansas has a friend in the Governor's office in Arkansas for whom he voted and whom he supported.

These two States are submitting statements of what they need from the Federal Government in order to carry on their schools. Here is Arkansas, which says it needs \$2,241,924 to keep its schools going.

Mr. President, how much does Louisiana say it needs? How much would it like to have from the Federal Government? The request of Arkansas is for \$2,241,000; that of Louisiana is for \$107,000, and whether they give us \$107,000 or not, it will not make any difference; we will run the schools 9 months in the year, and every child will have free school books just the same.

Why that difference? It is for the same reason which makes the Senator and me differ here. The Senator's philosophy has been followed in Arkansas; mine has been followed in Louisiana. They do not tax the Power Trust up in Arkansas as we do in Louisiana, so there is not money to furnish the children schooling. That is one reason, just one little reason. They do not tax the oil companies up in Arkansas as we do in Louisiana, so there is no money with which to buy books for the children, and they have not money with which to run the schools.

There are two States with the same resources, the same kind of people, one of them bogged in the mud, calling for two and a half million dollars, and the other State calling for practically nothing, the distinction being because of the theories of government followed by the friends of the Senator from Arkansas in Arkansas as contradistinguished to the theories of government followed by my friends in the State of Louisiana.

I have tried to advise my friend the Senator from Arkansas as a friend. I will never refer to him as being ignorant, or as being arrogant, or as egotistical. I will never undertake to humiliate him, or to impose an overpowering knowledge on him, which, of course, I do not possess, but were I to possess it I would not seek to impose it on him in such manner as he assumes toward me. But, humble as I am, I will yet give him advice. Judged by these remarks, I know the Senator nurses in his heart a grudge on account of advice which I undertook to give him here last year.

I am a friend of the people who run the Power Trust; I am really a friend to them, and most of them will say so. I am really a friend of the oil people, and even some of them will say so; most of them will now, since we made our compromise the other day. But all the time the Senator from Arkansas has continued to refer to me as having made insinuations against Members of the Senate, when the only thing he can base it on is the fact that I submitted to the clerk here one day an advertisement in Martindale's Law Directory, published by the Senator's law firm themselves; that is all.

I was not responsible for the Martindale Law Directory. I have not made any statement, except what was published by the Senator. But I gave advice to the party, and I gave advice to the Senator, and I will give it now. Wherever your treasure is, there is your heart.

Mr. President, the Senator says that I have made a very, very grave attack on him. He continues to say that on the outside. I never repeat a private conversation until it has been repeated by others on this floor, or part of it has been repeated. Mr. Roosevelt was nominated for the Presidency. It was my duty to see that certain States did not have favorite-son candidates. One of those States was Arkansas, and I helped to see to that, had a little part in it; not a large part, but some.

We did not want favorite sons as candidates, and I helped keep down favorite sons in Arkansas, and I helped keep my friend the Governor of Mississippi from being a favorite-son candidate in his own State. He was a friend of mine and the Senator from Arkansas was a friend of mine, but I un-

dertook to keep down favorite-son candidates, because I knew what it would mean.

There has also been a lot of publicity given to the Caraway campaign. It has been published by the Saturday Evening Post that my campaign for Mrs. CARAWAY was a reflection against the senior Senator from Arkansas.

I did not publish it that way. The Senator ought to wreak his revenge on the newspapers and the magazines that did this, and not wreak it upon me. True it was that the other Senator from Arkansas had not voted with the other Senator very often here. If she had, she would not have been elected. But that was her record, the record that I defended. The Senator from Arkansas, none the less, from that day had apparently continued as though there were a serious breach between us.

Mr. President, I had a conversation with the present President of the United States, and when I tell you I had any conversation with him you can rely that I am going to be very careful not to overstate it. I asked him what he was going to do about the leadership in the United States Senate, and he gave me his ideas. They were not favorable to the Senator from Arkansas.

But a friend of mine was out in the Southwest, and he returned and said, "I saw Senator So-and-so." He is no longer a Member of this body. I do not have this Senator's permission to tell this, and I am not going to disclose names, but he is sitting here now and he knows I am telling the truth. This friend of mine said, "I saw Senator So-and-so, and he told me that Mr. Farley had told him to keep HUEY LONG in trouble in that Overton investigation as long as he could; they wanted to keep him where they could handle him."

Well, those are the same words as the President had told me about the Senator from Arkansas. [Laughter.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. Those in the galleries will kindly refrain from audible laughter.

Mr. LONG. So I went back to my room after I got that message and I put two and two together. Here I was on the bandwagon to start with, and a member of that committee had been told to keep me on the spot. Notwithstanding all the money I put up, notwithstanding everything I had done, he had been given the order to keep something going against HUEY LONG in the Senate, keep him on the spot, put ants on him, and let him scratch a while. And the language sounded exactly like the message that had come to me from the President, and I told the Senator from Arkansas about it, too, did I not?

Mr. ROBINSON. No.

Mr. LONG. Did I not?

Mr. ROBINSON. No.

Mr. LONG. I did not tell you, did I? The Senator's memory and mine differ. At any rate we met, the Senator and I did; we met over here in the Senator's office. I do not mind telling the Senate who met with us—Mr. Harvey Couch—Power Trust man. He is a personal friend of mine and a personal and political friend of the Senator from Arkansas. The Senator's law firm, or a member of it, Mr. Moses, I believe it was, had been Mr. Couch's lawyer for a long time. So we met over here, and we concluded that we would be pretty good friends, and just drop matters as they stood; let it go. I had my message that I was to be kept with ants on me, and I had another message that ants were to be kept on him. So I compared the notes. I had been leading the fight up to that time, or shortly before that time, that the Senator from Arkansas was not the man to be leader of the Democratic side of the Senate. And if Senators will go back and read the newspapers, any number of publications were out that he was not going to be the leader of the Senate any longer for this side.

All right. So we did not bury the hatchet, but we just kind of smoothed the thing over, and it went on. We had a conversation, the Senator from Arkansas and I did, and I am afraid the Senator is not going to remember this conversation, and I will not reflect on him if he does not.

I said then and there, "I may have trouble, because I am going to go as I please in this business, and I look for this

man to try to name men through the United States Senate who are enemies of mine down in Louisiana. Now, how are you going to stand on it?"

The Senator from Arkansas, as best I can remember, said to me: "When William F. McCoombs was up in New Jersey, or somewhere up here, he had a brother in Arkansas that he wanted a job for. I was in Arkansas, and I either got a telegram or a letter or some other kind of a message from Woodrow Wilson telling me that he would like to give Mr. McCoombs a job. I sent back to him," said the Senator from Arkansas, "this message: 'Mine is the right of selection. Yours is the right of rejection.'" And the Senator gave me to understand that was still his position.

Now, he may not remember that. I will not reflect on him if he does not remember. I never have, and I never will.

However, I do not know of a thing that was said in that conversation concerning which I did not keep my word. I do not know of a thing that I said from that day that authorized any breach of it. But the Senator's mind is not my mind. Either he forgets or I forget, or perhaps I imagine. The fault will have to be discovered by others. But none the less there came in appointments to the Senate—D. D. Moore, collector of internal revenue, and René Viosca for United States attorney.

The record is here. However, I want to say for the Senator from Arkansas, I believe he wanted to discharge that obligation the best he thought he dared do. I did not hold him down to the point of saying, "You take the chance, you stay by our agreement." I did not do that, Mr. President. I was generous. I fought the battle without making that demand. I did not ask it of him. I knew that he was at the time the leader here under what we thought was a very popular President. But I had made some promises. I had to live up to my promises. I had to be mashed out keeping them. I had to be flattened out keeping several of them. I had made some promises I could not go back on. And I want to say to the credit of the Senator from Arkansas that I thought I observed in his conduct a desire, if the opportunity came his way, not to have the matter forced any farther than possible for confirmation over my objection. He did not vote that way exactly, you understand, Mr. President, and he did not speak exactly that way, Mr. President, but I thought I saw hidden back there somewhere that he would like to keep that understanding, and so I have always felt kindly on that score.

I did sound a word of warning to the Senator from Arkansas. His people need him more than my people need me. My people in Louisiana need my vote very bad, and they need the vote of my colleague very bad, but they do not need my vote in Louisiana nearly so bad as the poor people of Arkansas—good people that they are, lovely people, and my friends, a large majority of them. They need the vote of their Senator, and he can do more to help them than I can do. So I have undertaken to advise the Senator from Arkansas. Why? I know he is on the wrong path. I know he is going wrong. I know, Mr. President, for his own sake that he is treading a bad course politically; but I know for the sake of the people of the State of Arkansas and even of other States that there is in the wake of his votes disaster, consequences not to be felt alone by the Senator, but consequences to be borne by 125,000,000 people to a large extent.

The Democratic Party is in the ascendancy. It did not come into the ascendancy on the doctrines of the Senator from Arkansas. On the contrary, when we went back to Arkansas to wage the campaign for HATTIE CARAWAY for the United States Senate one of the first things that we drew the line on was that a power tax had been voted, and that on a reconsideration the vote had been to put the power tax on the consumer still rather than to put it on the power company, and that the Senator whom I was undertaking to help to reelect had voted that it should not be put on the consumer but should be put on the power companies. That had been the position, as I understood, of the Democratic House, and it was reversed here by the Republican Senate largely through the help and leadership of the Democratic Party.

When we nominated Roosevelt it was against all the Senator from Arkansas stood for. I say that knowing what the words are. It was against the philosophy of the Senator from Arkansas. Why, Mr. President, the leadership on the Republican side in many instances was more liberal toward the Roosevelt policy than the stand of the Senator from Arkansas. I can go down the line and show that former Senator Smoot, of Utah, was more liberal in many respects than the Senator from Arkansas himself. We were running on a liberal ticket.

The Senator from Arkansas has seen fit, because of the fact that I have undertaken to continue to advocate exactly what was promised by this party, to condemn me personally in every way he sees fit. There is a time for that. The Senator suggested that General Johnson and I should have a fist fight; that the way for me to settle my battles in the Senate is to have a fist fight.

That is bad advice from the Senator. He settled a claim like that at the Chevy Chase Country Club. I do not want to settle one that way, because I am liable to have the same disaster visit me as a Member of the Senate that he had visited on him as a member of the Chevy Chase Country Club. He is giving me bad advice. That is why I shall not take his advice. That is one reason. Another reason is that I am not much of a fighting man until I have to fight. I am not in the fighting business. That is not my occupation. I have made a living in many ways, but the worst one I have ever had recommended was the fighting way. Sometimes all of us may have that to do, and all of us will when we have to, but I am not recommending that.

I think the Senator from Arkansas is beneath what he is recommending to others; that is, when he is recommending decorum in the Senate he is beneath his own recommendation.

There has been offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], to be printed in the RECORD today, the speech of General Hugh Johnson. I know the Senator from Missouri never read the speech or he would not have offered it.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I am frank to say I did not hear the speech and did not read it, but when the Senator from Louisiana, answering that speech, consumed a very large amount of important time which should have been devoted to public business, it seemed to me in common justice to all concerned the speech should be inserted in the RECORD.

Mr. LONG. I knew the Senator had not read the speech because the speech contains matter that is not only abusive, but is indecent. It went over the radio, and that will stand all right. As long as the one speaks for the powers, as long as one speaks for the man that has the power in his hands, he can abuse his privileges as he may desire. There is no greater act showing our character than to take advantage of power momentarily in our hands and using that as a means of abuse of anyone.

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

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. Does not the Senator think it is an equal abuse to take advantage of privileges such as belong to a Senator, and make a one-sided statement without having the other side presented? In other words, does not the Senator think it is an abuse of his privilege as a Senator to get up and make an abusive speech about General Johnson without putting in the RECORD the speech which he is answering?

Mr. LONG. The Senator knows I am not going to make any remarks to hurt him. I hope the Senator will not ask me to yield again. I will answer that question, but I hope the Senator will not ask me any more questions.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President—

Mr. LONG. I am going to answer the Senator, if he will be patient just a moment.

My belief is that there would be nothing improper in putting General Johnson's speech in the RECORD except insofar as that speech violates the code of decency or the rules

of the Senate. I challenge anybody to take the speech I have made here—I have not read it yet—and find one word in the world that is a violation of the rules of the Senate in any respect. If it does contain anything of that kind, I shall strike it out and apologize to the Senate for it. I have been very careful in that respect.

I want to say further that I have been the leader of a majority bloc, too—not in the United States Senate, but in a small capacity. I am only a small fish in only a small area, even if I am sometimes called, as the Senator suggested, "The Kingfish", but I have wielded the authority of the majority for many, many, many years. I desire to state, Mr. President, that never has there been an act by which I have violated the code of fair fighting because temporarily I had the majority and could have used that privilege on our side.

Not only do I look on it that way, but I have never jumped on a fallen foe. I have never jumped on one that was falling. I despise the man who hits the dead lion. I have never done it. I am not in keeping with the policy of a government that jumps on the dead lions and leaves the other monsters alive and ferocious. I do not even appreciate all the hunting they did of Mitchell when he went broke nor of Insull when he went broke, but which leaves Baruch and Owen D. Young and J. P. Morgan killing rats at the same stand. I did not feel that was the way to run the Government.

I want to tell the Senate how mankind is found out. When you have trouble on your hands and you have made a bargain with a man and you are keeping your side of that bargain, the way to find out that man is when your stock begins to get low and he jumps on you when your blood is getting down to the ebbing stage. I have had those experiences. I have had them here in the city of Washington.

I am not going to take advantage of any authority I have in Louisiana. If I have any, it is no more than the Senator from Arkansas has in Arkansas. There is only one difference between us. In Louisiana the people want what Huey Long wants. I have no more control over those in power in Louisiana, and am no better friend to them than the Senator from Arkansas is to those in Arkansas. But in Louisiana the people want what Huey Long wants and in Arkansas the people do not want what the Senator from Arkansas wants. That is the only difference between us. I would be called a dictator in Arkansas if I would be called a dictator in Louisiana, according to the words of the Senator from Arkansas. Why not call me one in Arkansas? Everything I have asked the people of Arkansas to do they have done—they will do it again, too, next year—and I will never have to utter a word of reflection upon anyone, or violate the code of the Senate to get them to do so.

Now, let me see:

The Senator from Arkansas said:

For instance, by implication, he seemingly denounced Mr. Baruch for the statement that German reparations should be fixed in a definite amount.

That is not what I did at all. What I said was that in that statement Mr. Baruch recommended that \$8,000,000,000 of German bonds should be financed in this and other countries, and that they ought to be floated on the market as fast as they could be. German bonds and German marks were sold in this country; and what has happened to the purchasers of the German bonds and German marks, and how are the purchasers ever going to get back a dime of their money?

Now, let us see how fair the Senator has been in other respects, if I may just take out a line or two:

It is my information that Mr. Baruch has never sought to impose his views on any President;

Did I say that he had sought to impose his views on any President? What difference does it make? No one is going to deny how influential he has been, according to the magazine of J. P. Morgan.

that when he has acted, he has acted at the solicitation or request of the head of the Government.

In other words, Mr. Baruch is such a towering genius that all he has done has been done at the request of the

Presidents of the United States, as many of them as have sent for Baruch, and Baruch never coming down here of his own volition. That is what we tried to get rid of. What business has Baruch here? Does anybody know an industry of which he is the head? No one knows any business of which he is the head, so far as I know. I do not know of anybody who does. He does not run any enterprise that I know of. I may be wrong. He is a cracker-jack manipulator of markets and bonds and stock. Well, should he be?

Why, Mr. President, if you put me down here where I have one of my men running the N. R. A., and another one of them over here, and then set me over in the White House where I know what is going on over there, and I know whether the dollar is going to be \$1.59 or \$1.69, and I know whether this thing or that thing is going to come out, as dumb as I am, I can tell you the effect it is going to have on the market.

I never played the market in my life. I never bet a nickel on the cotton exchange in my life. I never bet a dime on a horse race in my life. I never bet a dime on a market stock in my life. As dumb as I am—and I am the dumbest of them all—right today, as dumb as I am, if you will give me the same men that Baruch had, and put me where Baruch was, if I do not clean up ten or fifteen million dollars by rigging the market I am willing to step out and go back and try to farm—which I never was able to do—for the balance of my life.

You just put me where Baruch was! Call him a smart man! He is not in any business. Some of you Senators may think politics is a game with me, and with others—maybe not with yourselves. It may be a game with me. There is nobody in this body who has paid as much for his convictions as I have paid in politics. Nobody in this body has paid as much for his own convictions as I have paid. I was properly interpreted, away in advance, when they concluded that they had better do something to put the "jinx" on HUEY LONG, because he might not go along. They knew their man. I would not go along. I would not vote for the economy bill to cut the soldiers' compensation when we had said we were not going to do it. I would not vote for various and sundry other things of that kind that we said we were not going to do. Certainly I would not; and all the patronage and all the contests they might bring here were not going to affect my vote or my position, and they did not close my mouth in the Senate or outside the Senate.

I want Senators to be witnesses to one thing. You have seen me in this body with that kind of a matter being pushed. You have seen them send their horde of income-tax sleuths, investigators, and spies by the hundreds to Louisiana. You have seen them take them off the Lindbergh case; you have seen them take them off the oil cases; you have seen the chase of the hounds; and you have seen the elections.

I had to stand a defeat in one of them; but you have never seen them close the mouth of HUEY P. LONG in the Senate, or change the position of HUEY P. LONG in the United States Senate. I have been very happy it has been me they have been trying it on, too, because I knew what effect it would have on me. A seat in the Senate is not that dear to me. It does not mean that much.

We are going to have this matter out next year in Louisiana and Arkansas. We are going to have it out, and I am going to be nice, and I am going to be respectful to the Senator from Arkansas. I do not know whether or not he is going to run. I do not know. Perhaps I will not run. I think I will, if there is anybody to run against me. They say the administration will get me up an opponent and put out all the money necessary. The newspapers say that. It will take a whole lot. It will take lots of it, and we will get most of it, Mr. President. When they begin to shell out the money, we will get plenty of it. I will be paying for circuits with their money before they get through with it. [Laughter.]

We have had this thing to fight before. We know what we are up against. When they send down there into that little old State of Louisiana, and they begin to shell out the coin, they are going to find that our boys are going to

be right there legally taking the money. We are going to give them leaders. Why, bless your soul, the people in charge of the national administration's ticket last time, Mr. Farley's ticket, went over to a parish to one of my main leaders, and they said, "Here, we want this organization to fight FERNANDEZ for Congress."

Now, FERNANDEZ is a Representative, and he has voted for everything Roosevelt has had up over there; but because he is a friend of HUEY LONG he had to be beaten. So they went over to one of my leaders in the parish of Jefferson. I will tell you where it is. You can go there and try to hire another, and I will give you one. We will still own your leader. It does not make any difference whom you hire; I will still be writing your articles the next morning, and we will be spending your money the next day, because those people down there are loyal to principle, and you cannot buy them. It does not make any difference how much they give them, they are not going to be bought. It cannot be done. [Laughter in the galleries.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will suspend until the Chair admonishes the occupants of the galleries.

The Senate has been very liberal with its guests. Unless we can have order in the galleries, however, unless overruled by the Senate itself, the Chair will order the galleries cleared. If the occupants of the galleries desire to remain as the guests of the Senate, they will kindly comply with its rules.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, they wanted a leader. They wanted an organization. Well, I had an organization. I had two organizations; so I just sat down and wrote them out one and kept one for myself. On the day of election both of them went to the polls, and about 6 o'clock in the evening our gang just tore off the badges, and everybody put on Long badges, and said, "Now, by golly, we are going to give you a fair deal! Let's open the boxes and count up the ballots"; and out of about 10,000 votes they had about 800, I think, that they got out of the whole list; and they are not going to get that many next time.

We were trying to elect a judge of the supreme court. They had one of their leaders whom they had distributing their patronage over there under Mr. Farley go out to a little old ballot box outside of Villa Platte, La., about 7 or 8 miles out there, maybe a little farther, and they stood there, I think it was, for 113 men, and 113 men took the \$10. Then we opened the ballot box and they had 4 votes out of 113. Now, you go back down there with it. We are going to tell those people to take the money legally—take the money.

They have published it in their papers down there always, and I know what I will have to fight. You have the advantage. I fight on the heavy side. I know I have not the advantage. I have not the money, I have not the corporate influences, I have not the newspapers, I have not the money that is being taxed out of these poor devils, to be paid to them in part, and later on they are going to have to pay it all back. I have not the money to fight that kind of thing. I have not an even fight, I have not an even break. I am willing to take the chances on how the Senator from Arkansas and I come out, both in Louisiana and in Arkansas, in the fall of next year.

There will be no more compromise, Mr. President. There will be no more shaking of hands, either. That is the last time.

The Senator said:

What right has the Senator from Louisiana to denounce his former friend, the President of the United States, in language like that which he employed today?

What language? What language have I used that is not simply criticizing and deploring the methods being followed today by the President of the United States?

Oh, I know the Senator from Arkansas sits close to the President, and it is right that he should. I sat closer than he did once. That was when they needed me. They do not need me now, perhaps. That is all right. He sits differently now. But I do not know whether some of the publicity on the outside is exactly fair. After I thought the Senator was

going to uphold my hand in Louisiana, I pick up my home paper, the Times-Picayune, and I see that the rice administrator for Louisiana is one recommended by the Senator from Arkansas. They publish that as a great victory scored by the Senator from Arkansas over the Senator from Louisiana, that the rice administrator for Louisiana is recommended by the Senator from Arkansas. A good gentleman—I hope he is—comes from Arkansas to Louisiana, a brother-in-law of the Senator from Arkansas. His brother-in-law has come to Louisiana. I am going to keep my brothers-in-law in Louisiana, but I am going to Arkansas next year, and I am going to ask for some of that pie in Arkansas after next September or November. I may not get it, but I will ask for it just the same.

The Senator on the floor here, the other day, referred to martial law in Louisiana as being a terrible thing. They have had martial law in all the States every now and then. It is not the first time they have had it in Louisiana.

Why not martial law? Here is the legislature which votes a tax. They do not take it to the courts, they do not take it to the people, because it had been an issue in a political campaign, and the people had voted our way. Men assembled, armed with guns, told to reassemble and rearm with guns, to kill and murder. Who were the men? Nearly all of them were employees of one corporation.

What were we to do? Were we to sit there and have the laws of the country run with men armed with shotguns, nearly all employees of a corporation, because they do not want something done, or are we to have things done according to law and order? And in that situation not one man has lost his life.

The Senator did not talk about martial law being so bad in Minnesota, and several men lost their lives there. They have had martial law in Arkansas where men have lost their lives. Louisiana has had no loss of life. Louisiana has had law and order, and ought to have been supported rather than condemned.

I want to show the Senate how they have handled these matters. There was a man down there by the name of Parker, a deputy sheriff. Three witnesses swore under oath that he was party to a conspiracy, the leader in the conspiracy to murder me in that State. Three witnesses, one a State senator, one a deputy sheriff, one a former employee of the United States Internal Revenue Department, swore lip to lip, eye to eye, corroborated by other people, one a stenographer who even took down a conversation coming over the telephone, that this man Parker arranged for the exact time, place, and date to murder me on the road from Baton Rouge.

What happened? Parker was called to the witness stand and asked to answer, and before the court declined to answer, on the ground that it would incriminate him if he answered the question.

What happened to Parker? Farley's crowd brought him here to Washington and made him a policeman at the other end of this Capitol, and published the fact in the newspapers.

Law and order, is it? Oh, that is all right. I would not have thought of doing a thing like that and countenancing it toward the Senator from Arkansas. A man who threatened to murder me, whose conversation was taken down by a stenographer, with a State senator a witness, a deputy sheriff a witness, and a United States officer, just retired, a witness, all of them of splendid reputation, was brought here by the Farley regime to the city of Washington and a gun put on him, and his picture published in every newspaper in this city, with the statement that he, this would-be murderer, was here in easy range of the Senator from Louisiana. I knew I was in no danger in the daytime from that man.

That is government for you! That is what we are led to believe that one who cries out against that kind of a travesty must stand, under the ponderous weight of the Senator from Arkansas, who regards no rule, who regards no precedent, who none the less asserts his right, whether there is any right or not, to say and do as he pleases.

Mr. President, I am not undertaking to answer the charge that I am ignorant. It is true. I am an ignorant man. I have had no college education. I have not even had a high-school education. But the thing that takes me far in politics is that I do not have to color what comes into my mind and into my heart. I say it unvarnished. I say it without veneer. I have not the learning to do otherwise, and therefore my ignorance is often not detected.

I know the hearts of people, because I have not colored my own. I know when I am right in my own conscience. I do not talk one way in this cloakroom and another way out here. I do not talk one way back there in the hills of Louisiana and another way here in the Senate. I have one language. Ignorant as it is, it is a universal language within the sphere in which I operate. Its simplicity gains pardon for my lack of letters and education.

The Senator says I am quite egotistical. Perhaps so; I do not know; that may be true also. It probably is true. If it gives me any satisfaction, hounded as I have been, I hope the Senator will not begrudge my being egotistical. Perhaps it might give him a little satisfaction. I have been accused of almost everything from stealing a cord of wood up to murder. Every time I have written a law to put a school-book in the hands of children, every time I have fought through the courts for the upholding of a law that took innocent people out of the jail cells, I have been attacked in the press. I have been defamed every time I have managed to sustain a principle that meant education and life, that gave a chance to the boys of Louisiana, Arkansas, and Mississippi and other States. They all come to Louisiana—they all come there because they do not have in Arkansas or in Mississippi a medical school which is the pride of the world, where it does not cost you \$400 and \$500 a year for tuition to study medicine, but where you can study it free; no other State in the Union has that except Louisiana; none have anything like it.

I have had to stand the persecutions in this body, and I have had to stand the persecutions before the courts and the infamous blackmail in the publications of this country, undertaking by every means, foul or otherwise, to reassert such calumnies as the Senator from Arkansas indulges in here, that there has been some nefarious motive in my undertaking to provide for the people in my State when people in the surrounding States have not been provided for.

Senators do not have to take my word for it. Look on the front page of the Times-Picayune, which is represented in this document I have here, and it will be found that Louisiana does not need relief as other States are needing it. Why? That is the cause of the clamor. The Senator from Arkansas does not see like I see. He does not view these matters as I view them. It will be his own fortune and not mine. We would all be personally fortunate today if we were voted out of the United States Senate. There is no man here who would not be lucky the day he loses his place in the Senate as I have seen it. There is not a living on the money we receive for serving here, and Senators are afraid to vote for a living. I hope I have not violated the rules of the Senate in saying that. If I have, I will take it back. But there is not a living here, and I do not believe we will ever vote for a living. Let me put it in that language. The living I have had is not paid here. It is about the sorriest one I have ever had since I left the printing office. Not near as good as I had on the farm. So we will all be fortunate when we lose our seats here. But if we want to stay here and live nonetheless, I say that there is a certain section of this country that is informed; I repeat, there is a certain section of these United States that is informed. Out in the wide open spaces the people are not going to stand for these things. Take my word for it.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, may I interrupt.

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. I am utterly unwilling to take your word for that or anything else.

Mr. LONG. Well, I think the Senator thinks that is very smart.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I do not think it is smart, but it is an honest expression based on his utterances here.

Mr. LONG. Yes, sir. But I will bet he does not go back to the United States Senate next year. How about that? I just make a prophecy you will not be reelected to the United States Senate.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I am utterly indifferent—

Mr. LONG. I hope you are, because you are not coming back.

Mr. BAILEY. To the Senator's judgment concerning me or my prospects of coming back.

Mr. LONG. All right, sir. The Senator has seen fit to hurl an unnecessary insult at me. I do not answer it except by saying: I bet you do not come back to the Senate.

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

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. The Senator from Louisiana directed his index finger directly at me and asked me what I had to say. I just could not be silent under the circumstances, and I spoke the truth.

Mr. LONG. That is perfectly all right. I have not a doubt in my mind that the Senator will not be here after next year. He wrote me a little different about that a while back. He wrote me a nice letter telling me what a nice man I was and how I had been done such great injustice. I still have the letter. Of course, he has changed his mind lately. That is perfectly all right. I let every man take his own stand, Mr. President, with me. Whenever you want to be an enemy of mine, that is an easy thing to be. I will reciprocate it right off the bat. If you want to be a friend of mine, I will go double the way. It is no trouble to have me either for a friend or an enemy. I will take whichever pole a man wants to pick. I have never seen them too big and never seen them too little. I would rather have any man for my friend than to have him for my enemy—any man—but whenever he chooses the reverse, I have never quarreled about it. I will meet them in their own balliwicks. I will not be unfair with them. I will invite them to my own, if they can get anybody to talk to. And I will go to their own balliwicks.

I said the people are not going to stand for this thing we are doing here. I hope I have not pointed toward the same Senator again. They are not going to stand it. You cannot keep these people starving to death in the United States, as has been done these last 2 years, under a promise that we made to these people that we were going to do this very thing.

Mr. DIETERICH. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state the point of order.

Mr. DIETERICH. This body has not been guilty of starving people to death in the last 2 years. I ask the Senator to take his seat until my point is decided.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under rule XIX, the Senator from Louisiana will take his seat until the Senator from Illinois has stated his point of order.

Mr. DIETERICH. My point of order is that the Senator made a remark which cast a reflection upon the Senate. That he said that we had kept the people starving to death for the last 2 years. That the people would not continue to tolerate that. The Senate has not been responsible for any misery, but the Senate has tried to relieve it for the last 2 years.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It occurs to the Chair that that is a matter of opinion, and that probably the Senator from Louisiana has a right to express his opinion as to what effect the legislation has had upon the country.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President—

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

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. As I understood the Senator's statement he was perfectly within his rights. He said "You cannot let the people starve as they have been starving the last 2 years." That was not a reflection upon the Senate of the United States, unless someone is so thin-skinned he cannot stand that kind of language. I suggest, Mr. President, in all fairness, that the statement made by the Senator is as the Vice

President has ruled; that he has made a perfectly logical statement, because there are millions of people at the present time who are underfed and who are undernourished in this great country of ours.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, a point of order. The Chair has ruled. Therefore the Senator is out of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has already ruled that the Senator from Louisiana was within the rules of the Senate, and the Chair recognizes the Senator from Louisiana. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. LONG. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. WHEELER. I had finished my statement.

Mr. LONG. I am glad, Mr. President, that the Senate has found out that there are hungry people in the United States. I was afraid they did not know that. I am sorry my friend from Illinois has not found that out. It is too bad. That is our trouble. I did not intend, of course, as I hope my friend will understand, to reflect upon the Senate. I say again, at the risk of being misunderstood, that you cannot—we cannot—sit here and let this starvation in the United States continue two more years like we have the last two. We told the people we knew about the starvation in this country, and we told them how we were going to end it. We told them a whole lot—maybe we told them too much. But we told them we knew all about it; and the people of the United States are not going to stand for it. You remember what I am saying. The people of the United States are not going to stand for this distress and this destitution and this wreckage which is going on and has been here for the last 2 or 3 or 4 years in the form of famine even in a land of too much of everything.

I have tried to be generous. I have tried to be fair. I have tried to be honorable. If I have uttered an insulting word to a man in this body at any time I do not know what it has been, and I would undertake to correct it if I had.

I have lived within the rule. Let me tell you something: Do not think I am going to take anything off of anybody that is not right and fair, because I am not. I am not afraid of anybody. I am not going to be afraid. I have enjoyed my life because I have never allowed myself to get afraid even when I wanted to be. I am not going to get afraid of anybody nor anything. What do I care for a life of ease in the United States Senate when my brothers and sisters, my uncles and aunts, my relatives and friends, are starving to death? What do I care, then, about a little old job in the United States Senate?

I have suffered much from a little write-up which I saw in a Chicago paper about a little 4-year-old boy who was out at 5 o'clock in the morning with an ax on his shoulder hunting for wood to cut because his mother was freezing. I suffered more from reading that article than I had pleasure from any job that came to me because of being in the United States Senate. I have suffered more from a picture on the front page—oh, yes; I see you smile! It tickles you. That is what makes it so hellish to me—that a man can enjoy sitting in a body like this with starvation and pestilence existing among the people. That is what makes it so disgusting. Where is the honor, the sincerity, the humanity left that a man can smile at such conditions?

I have suffered more at seeing the front page of the American Magazine weekly, showing a child standing in front of a furnace in a show window, carrying the statement that he had been to the foreman's house and had seen three furnaces in one house, and yet that child was standing in the snow freezing. Hundreds of them are doing that, starving to death—literally starving to death. I have picked up and helped men who were trying to maintain the appearance of respectability, trying to make their collars look clean, trying to make their clothes look respectable, when they were starving to death on the inside.

We do not know half the misery going on in this country because 80 percent of it is still shielded beneath the pride of the people who hate to admit among their neighbors the destitution into which they have fallen.

Let the Senate go on. Let the Senator from Arkansas insult everybody who dares to come here and point out that

the wreckage of Baruchism under Hoover is the wreckage of Baruchism under Roosevelt. Let it go on. Let the Senator go on. None the less my voice will be the same as it has been. Patronage will not change it. Fear will not change it. Persecution will not change it. It cannot be changed while people suffer. The only way it can be changed is to make the lives of these people decent and respectable. No one will ever hear political opposition out of me when that is done.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, the Senator from Louisiana has concluded his remarks by an effort to make it appear that there is someone here who has willingly contributed to destitution in the country or has been amused at poverty and suffering. I think everyone who hears me will agree that this is illustrative of the methods of the Senator from Louisiana which I characterized in a previous speech this day.

The Congress during the present administration, the administration which the Senator from Louisiana so bitterly condemns, has appropriated literally billions of dollars from the Treasury for the purpose of relieving suffering among our citizens. We have now under consideration a great measure designed for the same purpose, carrying approximately \$5,000,000,000.

It is not based on facts nor on justice nor on generosity, nor any other attribute which the Senator from Louisiana claims for himself to the exclusion of his colleagues in the Senate, to say that the Senate is desirous of starving the people of the country. It is a declaration which is illustrative of the character which underlies the speech that has just been made.

The Senator from Louisiana has made personal allusions of which I shall take no notice. The Senate cannot be interested in the petty conversations, the disagreements or the agreements, into which the Senator from Louisiana and other Senators have entered.

He did make one statement with respect to myself to which I wish to make a brief reply. He said that the administration of State affairs in Arkansas occupies the same relation to me that the administration of affairs in Louisiana has to himself or, to quote his statement more accurately, that I am exerting the same influence and control over the administration of State affairs in Arkansas that he is exerting in Louisiana.

Mr. President, since retiring from the office of Governor of Arkansas a good many years ago and becoming a Member of this body I have never in any way interfered in or sought to control the administration of public affairs in that State. It has been my policy to permit those officers whom the people select by the process of election to perform their constitutional and statutory duties. For that reason I am not so familiar with the situation of the State administration as I should like to be. It would be helpful to me in my work if I were more familiar with it. I have never sought to place in office as Governor of my State one whom I treated as a puppet, to whom I gave orders or instructions, and who was responsive to my dictates.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President—

Mr. ROBINSON. Yes; I yield to the Senator.

Mr. LONG. The Senator from Arkansas has some relatives on the pay roll?

Mr. ROBINSON. Oh, yes; and so has the Senator from Louisiana. What has that to do with it? That is another illustration of the magnitude of the mentality of the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. The Senator takes it as being outside of the proprieties to ask him if the relatives he has on the pay roll are not subject to his ordinary recommendations? If I was getting my relatives on the pay roll, I would think I had some influence with them.

Mr. ROBINSON. I have very few relatives on the pay roll of Arkansas, probably not half the number the Senator from Louisiana had on the pay roll of his State. I do not think that is relevant. I think it is silly, if I may use such a term in the United States Senate.

The point I am making is that I have never assumed to control the Governor of my State nor the other officers of my State. But what is the fact in that regard with respect to the Senator from Louisiana? He seems to boast of the fact that he is not only Senator but he is Governor.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. ROBINSON. Yes; I yield.

Mr. LONG. When did the Senator hear that?

Mr. ROBINSON. I have never heard anything else.

Mr. LONG. Did the Senator hear that from me?

Mr. ROBINSON. Yes; I never heard anything else from the Senator from Louisiana except that he was going down to his State to tell Governor Allen what to do. I have never heard anything else from him after he got there except quick, snappy orders to the Governor as to what he should do; and I will say of the Governor that he has been fairly responsive.

Mr. LONG. Did the Senator say he had heard that himself or heard me say that?

Mr. ROBINSON. Yes; I think the whole course of the Senator's addresses and his public interviews is to indicate that he is boastful of the fact that he dominates Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. Published interviews?

Mr. ROBINSON. Oh, well, I know the Senator—

Mr. LONG. I should just like to have the Senator refer to one of them.

Mr. ROBINSON. Oh, the Senator from Louisiana and I, I think, cannot agree about these things.

Mr. LONG. For instance, take the national administration. The Senator speaks for the national administration, does he not, quite frequently?

Mr. ROBINSON. Sometimes I feel that I do.

Mr. LONG. Sometimes I speak for my faction in Louisiana.

Mr. ROBINSON. If the Senator cannot perceive the difference between my relationship to the national administration and his relationship to the Governor of Louisiana, there is a hopeless obliquity in his mental vision.

Mr. LONG. There is a difference, and I will tell the Senator what the difference is. Will the Senator let me tell him?

Mr. ROBINSON. No; I think not.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARRISON in the chair). The Senator from Arkansas declines to yield.

Mr. ROBINSON. The Senator, I think, has claimed to himself a great many virtues. All the measures that he espouses are wholesome and in the interest of the people! He is the champion of the people; and his boast that he has some of the electors in Louisiana so well trained that they will take money from the opposition and still support him and his cause is remindful of an incident that is said to have occurred during the contest between the late President Theodore Roosevelt and Mr. Taft.

In a community, of course, without the knowledge of the candidates—a community said to be situated in Maryland—many efforts were being made to influence the electors, and there were said to be present persons who were expending money after the fashion that the Senator said money was expended in Louisiana. Some one approached an old colored man and asked him how he was going to vote. "Well," he said, "Mr. Taft's friends paid me \$15 and Mr. Rosenfelt's friends only paid me \$10. Being as I think Mr. Rosenfelt is the least corrupt, I think I will vote for him." [Laughter.]

Mr. President, of course, under our standard of government and of politics it is nothing to boast of that one's supporters will take money from the opposition and still remain loyal.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President—

Mr. ROBINSON. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. LONG. How are we going to break up this corruption that the national administration—

Mr. ROBINSON. By men like the Senator from Louisiana, of great power, refusing to be corrupt, and refusing to participate in corruption. That is the best way to do it.

Mr. LONG. No; but let me ask the Senator further: When they are running a gang of brigands and thieves down there, and are trying to buy their way into office, do you not think honest people—

Mr. ROBINSON. Who started running the gangs of brigands and thieves?

Mr. LONG. For instance, in the Capital here—

Mr. ROBINSON. Whose gang started it, and who is it that goes about the Capital of the Nation and the capital of his own State with an armed guard, afraid that the people of his own State will do some violence to him?

Mr. LONG. Mr. President—

Mr. ROBINSON. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. LONG. Does the Senator think that with 400 armed men passing a resolution that they are going to meet the next day and kill me, I should go out without anybody?

Mr. ROBINSON. O Mr. President, it is well known that the Senator from Louisiana has been going about Washington with an armed guard ever since he has been a Member of the Senate. In my judgment, it is to his disgrace.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President—

Mr. ROBINSON. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. LONG. Do not the President of the United States and Mr. Farley have bodyguards? [Laughter.]

Mr. ROBINSON. Oh, yes; oh, yes! Now the Senator has it on the correct basis; has he not? [Laughter.]

Mr. President, I think the remarks of the Senator from Louisiana illustrate his conception of himself. Everything he does is all right. Everything you and I do is all wrong.

It is said that a few years ago a prominent American citizen was returning from a visit abroad, and he saw on the dock a gigantic object towering above everything that came within his vision—the most colossal object he had ever gazed upon—and he wondered what it was. When he arrived he found that it was nothing more than the opinion of the Senator from Louisiana of himself strutting around the dock. [Laughter.]

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

The Senator from Arkansas has referred to the fact that I have had an armed bodyguard. I wish to say to the Senator that Mr. Farley has armed bodyguards. I think I am as big as he is in the affairs of this country. I occasionally have to have a few with me—sometimes one, sometimes none—but when 50 men meet—

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President—

Mr. LONG. I rise to a question of personal privilege. I have a right to do that.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG. No; please let me get through. I shall be through in a minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. LONG. For instance, when the faction of the President of the United States brings a man up here and puts a gun on him, and three witnesses have sworn that he had been the leader of a conspiracy to murder me, and that he had said, "I cannot get him here, but I will get him in Washington", and after he takes the stand and refuses to testify on the ground that it would incriminate him, you bring him up here and give him a job, and then you criticize anybody for having anybody that might offset that kind of a culprit, that is a remarkable thing.

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

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, the Senator does not mean that I brought anybody here?

Mr. LONG. I do not mean you did.

Mr. ROBINSON. The Senator has said that twice.

Mr. LONG. I beg the Senator's pardon; I mean the national administration.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, now will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. LONG. Yes, sir; I am pleased to yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Does the Senator from Louisiana mean to say that he has an armed guard in the galleries of the Senate?

Mr. LONG. No.

Mr. McKELLAR. At any time?

Mr. LONG. No; I do not.

Mr. McKELLAR. Does he appear here in the galleries of the Senate armed?

Mr. LONG. He does not that I know of.

Mr. McKELLAR. Does he sit in the galleries day after day to guard the Senator?

Mr. LONG. Oh, no!

Mr. McKELLAR. Does he do it at all?

Mr. LONG. Oh, no! If I go out at night, or go to my home, I try to take someone with me. Does the Senator object to that?

Mr. McKELLAR. No; I have no objection to that; but I have been told that the Senator has an armed guard in the Senate gallery.

Mr. LONG. Well, I have not that I know of.

Mr. McKELLAR. Is he in the gallery now?

Mr. LONG. No; none that I see. Do you want me to go and count the occupants of the gallery? [Laughter.]

Mr. McKELLAR. No; but I think that if the Senator has an armed guard in the Senate gallery, it is something that the Senator ought not to be guilty of.

Mr. LONG. Well, what about this armed thug that you have got over here in the House of Representatives? Do you not think you ought to get him out of there, too?

Mr. McKELLAR. I have no armed thug anywhere.

Mr. LONG. I am not talking about you; but, since you are so excited, what did you think about their bringing this man Parker up here, whose picture they put in the paper, and three witnesses have sworn that he said he was coming here to Washington to kill me? What did you think of their putting him on the pay roll and giving him a gun to go around this Capitol? What do you want to do? Do you want to say that I have to be murdered here? Is that what you have to say, that I must go out and be shot? That is a marvelous thing you are doing here, and you raise holy murder—

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, as the Senator is addressing his remarks to me, I desire to say that I do not think anybody will ever do that. I doubt if they would fire at the Senator. I think the Senator is unduly alarmed about his own safety.

Mr. LONG. I am not unduly alarmed a bit. There is not anybody going to bother me, personally or otherwise.

GEN. JOHN H. RUSSELL

The Senate resumed the consideration of the nomination of John H. Russell to be a major general in the Marine Corps.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BLACK] to recommit the nomination to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

The motion was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of General Russell? [Putting the question.] The ayes have it, and the nomination is confirmed.

IN THE NAVY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations for promotions in the Navy.

Mr. TRAMMELL. I ask that the naval nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations for promotions in the Marine Corps.

Mr. TRAMMELL. I ask that the Marine Corps nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The legislative clerk read the nominations of Oscar Mikkelsen and Mark E. Bowers to be passed assistant dental surgeons.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. COPELAND. I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

JANUARY REPORT OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, reporting, pursuant to law, relative to the activities and expenditures of the Corporation for January 1935, together with a statement of authorizations made during that month, showing the name, amount, and rate of interest or dividend in each case, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

House Joint Memorial 4

A joint memorial requesting the construction by the Federal Government of the scenic highway from Santa Fe to Las Vegas, N. Mex., over the Sangre de Cristo Range through the Santa Fe National Forest

Be it enacted by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico: Whereas the Legislative Assembly of the Territory of New Mexico in 1903, in one of the first "good roads" measures in this State and the then Territory, established a public road from the city limits of Santa Fe in the county of Santa Fe to the limits of Las Vegas in the county of San Miguel, over the most feasible route through or near the canyon of the Santa Fe River over the Sangre De Cristo Range through the then United States Pecos River Reservation; and

Whereas such a highway, beginning at or near the canyon of the Santa Fe River, thence east over the mountain range in the most feasible and practical direct route to Las Vegas, would pass almost in its entirety through the Santa Fe National Forest, and over the Sangre De Cristo Range, the upper Pecos River country, and the most beautiful mountain parks region in this State, and would render to the inhabitants of this and other States accessibility to unexcelled scenic grandeur, and, for the purpose of trade and healthful recreation, would open up a section, now isolated, but abounding in beauty, resourceful in mineral deposits, and rich in historic associations; and

Whereas the Federal Government is creating public works for the purpose of relieving the distressed unemployed of the Nation, and the construction of such a road by the Federal Government would afford employment to the stricken and destitute unemployed of the counties of Santa Fe, Mora, and San Miguel; and

Whereas said highway would lie within the Santa Fe National Forest almost in its entirety, and it having been the policy of the National Government to improve its forest by the construction of roads and highways therein: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of New Mexico respectfully and earnestly memorialize and request the Congress of the United States and the Secretary of Agriculture to construct and maintain such a highway with Federal funds; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this memorial be sent to the President of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, the

Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Senators and Representatives of New Mexico in Congress.

ALVAN N. WHITE,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Attest:

J. R. T. HERRERA,
Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.
LOUIS C. DE BACA,
President of the Senate.

Attest:

F. E. McCULLOCH,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.
Approved by me this 23d day of February 1935.
CLYDE TINGLEY,
Governor of New Mexico.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate the following joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, which was referred to the Committee on Finance:

House Joint Memorial 7

A joint memorial petitioning Congress for consent to tax interstate sales of goods for use or consumption within the State

To the President and Congress of the United States:

Whereas it has come to the attention of this legislature that the United States Senate in the second session of the Seventy-third Congress passed Senate bill No. 2897, entitled "An act to regulate interstate commerce by granting consent of Congress to taxation by the several States of certain interstate sales", and that the same legislation has been proposed in the House by H. R. 8231 and H. R. 8303; and

Whereas the various States have had to resort to sales taxes of various kinds in order to meet emergencies which have arisen during this world crisis, to prevent collapse of their finances and to relieve the intolerable burden of property taxation; and

Whereas great hardship thereby has been imposed upon the local merchant because of the inability of the State to tax like sales by concerns doing a tax-exempt business across State lines in competition with such land merchants, and which commerce does not carry its proportionate share of the burden necessarily imposed on the same business when carried on by a citizen in the State, though receiving the same benefits and protection: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Twelfth Legislature of the State of New Mexico respectfully petition the President of the United States and the Congress thereof, to carry forward and enact into law such legislation as was initiated by Senate bill 2897, and H. R. 8231 and H. R. 8203, permitting the States with sales-tax laws to tax, on a nondiscriminatory basis, interstate sales of goods for shipment into the State, for use and consumption therein, in competition with like transactions of local merchants; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Clerks of the House of Representatives and of the Senate of the United States, and to the Senators and Members of Congress from New Mexico.

ALVAN N. WHITE,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Attest:

J. R. T. HERRERA,
Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.
LOUIS C. DE BACA,
President of the Senate.

Attest:

F. E. McCULLOCH,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.
Approved by me this 23d day of February 1935.
CLYDE TINGLEY,
Governor of New Mexico.

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

House Concurrent Resolution 9

A concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to amend the Bankhead Cotton Control Act to exempt the first three bales of cotton raised by any cotton grower from the operation of said law

Whereas the Bankhead Cotton Control Act in its present form operates as a severe restriction upon the income of the small farmer and grower of cotton, and especially on tenant farmers of Oklahoma and of the United States; and

Whereas the people of Oklahoma believe that the purpose of said act is to restrict the growing of cotton in large quantities on individual farms: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Fifteenth Legislature of the State of Oklahoma (the senate concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States is hereby memorialized by the people of the State of Oklahoma, through their representatives

in the legislature, to amend the Bankhead Cotton Control Act to exempt from the law the first three bales of cotton raised by any cotton grower of the United States whose major crop is cotton and whose major income is from cotton; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be mailed to the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States Congress and to each member of the Oklahoma delegation in Congress.

Adopted by the house of representatives on the 25th day of February 1935.

Adopted by the senate on the 20th day of February 1935.

LEON C. PHILLIPS,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
CLAUDE BRIGGS,
President pro tempore of the Senate.

Correctly enrolled.

LOUIE W. BECK,
Chairman Committee on Enrolled and Engrossed Bills.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate the following concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Arkansas, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

House Concurrent Resolution 18

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Arkansas, and the Senate concurring therein, That Arkansas is deeply interested in the passage of the work-relief bill proposed by our honored President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and the entire State is in need of the funds, and the permanent public improvements that will come to the State if such bill is passed;

That it is the sense of this body that it would be a mistake to attach to the proposed bill the so-called "McCarran amendment" providing that laborers on such relief works should receive the prevailing wage because such a provision would not only vastly increase the cost but also would deprive private industries of laborers who would flock to the easier Government work for the same wages;

That we respectfully urge upon our Senators and Representatives in Congress that they continue united and vigorous support of the President's own plan and aid in the passage of this deeply needed legislation;

That a copy of this resolution be sent to each Senator and Representative from this State to Congress.

I, H. P. Smith, hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of House Concurrent Resolution No. 18.

[SEAL] (Signed) H. P. SMITH,
Chief Clerk.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate the following joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

Senate Joint Memorial 12

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

We, your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, respectfully represent:

That the work of the Federal Bureau of Mines is of great importance to our State because of its great undeveloped resources of both base and precious metals;

That research and exploration conducted under the jurisdiction of this Bureau have in the past been of tremendous benefit in the discovery and development of the natural resources of our State;

That adequate appropriations for the maintenance of this Bureau should be provided in order that work now under way should not be curtailed and that further activities may be prosecuted looking toward a thorough development of the vast hidden treasures of our State: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Idaho (the house of representatives concurring), That we most respectfully urge upon the Congress of the United States that the proposed appropriation for the Bureau of Mines now pending in Congress is not sufficient for a proper functioning of the Bureau and that said appropriation should be increased so as to provide adequate funds for carrying on work already begun and making the Bureau an efficient and effective agency in the development of mining resources throughout the Nation; the providing of proper safety provisions in the industry and the collection and dissemination of authentic information concerning this great industry; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be authorized, and he is hereby directed, to immediately forward certified copies of this memorial to the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America and to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from this State.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate the following joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys:

House Joint Memorial 3

A memorial memorializing the President and Congress of the United States for a grant of land containing a hot-water spring for the use and benefit of the State of Montana as an infantile-paralysis sanatorium

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

Whereas the President of the United States, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, has set aside January 30 of this year for the purpose of raising funds for sanatoriums for the relief of infantile paralysis; and

Whereas it is impracticable to send those in need of treatment to other State sanatoriums; and

Whereas Montana was visited this past year by an epidemic of infantile paralysis, which will more than ever necessitate a means of treatment; and

Whereas there are remaining in the State of Montana several hot springs on vacant, unappropriated, unreserved public land: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the joint action of the Twenty-fourth Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana, That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to grant to the State of Montana a site containing a hot spring for the use and benefit of an infantile-paralysis sanatorium; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this memorial be forwarded to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives and each of the Senators and Members of the House of Representatives of Montana in Congress and to the Secretary of the Interior.

W. P. PILGERAM,
Speaker of the House.
ERNEST T. EATON,
President of the Senate.

Approved January 31, 1935.

F. H. COONEY,
Governor.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate the petition of Hannah Buckhalter, of Tibbee, Miss., praying for the enactment of old-age pension legislation, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also laid before the Senate petitions of sundry citizens of the State of California, praying for the adoption of the so-called "Townsend old-age-pension plan", which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also laid before the Senate resolutions adopted by the Chambers of Commerce of Canton and Yazoo County, Miss., opposing the ratification of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Deep Waterway Treaty, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisor of the City and County of San Francisco, Calif., protesting against enactment of legislation vesting any control of municipally owned water terminal facilities in the Interstate Commerce Commission, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also laid before the Senate a petition of sundry citizens of the State of Idaho, praying for the enactment of legislation to eradicate all subversive movements against the Government of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also laid before the Senate petitions of students of the Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, La.; of Bridgewater College, Bridgewater, Va.; and Florida Agricultural and Mechanical College, Tallahassee, Fla., favoring the enactment of the so-called "Costigan-Wagner antilynching bill", which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also laid before the Senate resolutions adopted by the Common Councils of Laredo, Tex., Trinidad, Colo., and Rochester, Minn., favoring the enactment of pending legislation proclaiming October 11 in each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. BARBOUR presented resolutions adopted by the Board of Commissioners of Perth Amboy and the Common Councils of the Cities of Nutley and Rahway, in the State of New Jersey, favoring the enactment of pending legislation proclaiming October 11 in each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a resolution of the Municipal Council of Clifton, N. J., favoring the enactment of the so-called "Patman bill", being the bill (H. R. 1) to provide for the immediate payment to veterans of the face value of their adjusted-

service certificates and for controlled expansion of the currency, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. MALONEY presented resolutions adopted by Group No. 25, of Bridgeport, District No. 152, of Waterbury, Group No. 2327, of Wallingford, and Group No. 1038, of Norwich, all of the Polish National Alliance of the United States of North America, in the State of Connecticut, favoring the enactment of pending legislation proclaiming October 11 in each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. TYDINGS presented memorials of officers and members of St. Anthony's Branch of the Baltimore Section of the Archdiocesan Union of the Holy Name Society, and members of the Holy Name Society of Mount St. Mary's College, Emmitsburg, in the State of Maryland, remonstrating against alleged antireligious conditions and religious persecutions in the Republic of Mexico, and condemning the alleged attitude of the United States Ambassador to that country, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Baltimore, Md., remonstrating against the publication of personal income-tax returns, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Frederick and vicinity, in the State of Maryland, praying for the adoption of the so-called "Townsend old-age-pension plan", which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a resolution adopted by Group No. 692 of the Polish National Alliance of the United States of North America, of Baltimore, Md., favoring the enactment of pending legislation proclaiming October 11 in each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. WALSH presented the memorial of the Board of Directors of the Peabody (Mass.) Chamber of Commerce, remonstrating against the enactment of Senate bill 1807, to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented the memorial of Dr. Daniel Lawrence Hunt and sundry other citizens of Boston, Mass., remonstrating against the making of an appropriation of \$4,880,000,000 for public-works relief, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also presented letters in the nature of petitions from the Joint Conference Board of Bookbinders of Greater Boston; Local No. 16, International Brotherhood of Bookbinders, of Boston; and International Wood Carvers' Association of Dorchester, all in the State of Massachusetts, praying for the adoption of the so-called "McCarran amendment" providing for the payment of prevailing wages in connection with proposed appropriations for public-works relief, which were referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also presented the petition of Harold N. Keith, Unit No. 204, American Legion Auxiliary, of West Boylston, Mass., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the payment of adjusted-compensation certificates of World War veterans, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented petitions of the Peabody Chamber of Commerce, of Peabody, and sundry citizens of Newton, Melrose, and Andover, all in the State of Massachusetts, praying for the enactment of legislation repealing the requirement of publicity in individual income-tax returns, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented the petitions of Lodge Fratelli Vandiera, No. 240, of Marlborough, and Lodge Eleonora Duse, No. 1690, of Norwood, both of the Order of Sons of Italy in America, in the State of Massachusetts, praying for inclusion in pending old-age-pension legislation of a provision whereby the benefit of pension would be extended to residents who have lived for many years continuously in the United States, although not naturalized, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Grand Executive Council, Massachusetts Grand Lodge, of the Order of Sons of Italy in America, favoring inclusion in pending old-age-pension legislation of a provision whereby the benefit of pension would be extended to residents who have lived continuously in the United States for 10 years, although not naturalized, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a letter from William Irving Brown, of Dorchester, Mass., enclosing copy of a speech to be used in the extension course (oratory) at Boston College, relative to the so-called "Townsend revolving old-age-pension plan", which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented letters and papers in the nature of petitions from the Worcester Laundry Owners' Association, of Worcester; the joint boards of the First Presbyterian Church, of Worcester, and C. Leslie Glenn, rector of Christ Church, of Cambridge, all in the State of Massachusetts, praying for amendment of proposed pension legislation providing that exemption be granted to organizations which provide pensions similar to the requirements of pending social-security legislation, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Lawrence, Mass., remonstrating against alleged antireligious conditions and religious persecutions in the Republic of Mexico, and favoring the recall of the United States Ambassador to that country, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented letters in the nature of petitions of Post No. 37, of Boston, and Post No. 29, of Lowell, both of the Polish Army Veterans' Association, in the State of Massachusetts, praying for the passage of House bill 2739, providing for an extension of time for the naturalization of alien veterans of the World War, which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented the memorial of the Worcester (Mass.) Laundry Owners' Association, remonstrating against the passage of legislation proposing to make the coal industry a public utility, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Barre, Mass., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation providing a 30-hour work week in industry and the making of a \$4,000,000,000 relief appropriation, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented the petition of members of the Lawrence Turn Verein, Lawrence, Mass., praying for the adoption of a constitutional amendment providing a referendum vote on declarations of war, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented the petitions of Local Union No. 2332, of Northbridge, and Local Union No. 2385, of Dudley, both of the United Textile Workers of America, in the State of Massachusetts, praying for the enactment of legislation providing a 30-hour work week in industry, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented memorials of employees of the Superior Laundry Co., the Boston Blacking & Chemical Co., the Tailby-Nason Co., the Ashton Valve Co., the Carter's Ink Co., and the Daggett Chocolate Co., and sundry employers of labor, all of Cambridge, Mass., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation providing a 30-hour work week in industry, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented the petition of Osmond Cummings, of Salisbury, Mass., praying for the passage of House bill 5846, to fix the value of subsistence and rental allowance under the Pay Readjustment Act of June 10, 1922, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented resolutions adopted by the General Court of Massachusetts, favoring adoption of the resolution (S. Res. 70) protesting against religious persecutions by the Government of Mexico, and authorizing an investigation

thereof by the Committee on Foreign Relations, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See resolutions printed in full when laid before the Senate on yesterday by the Vice President, p. 2814, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

Mr. LA FOLLETTE presented a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, favoring the enactment of legislation providing a relief program adequate to maintain a "decent standard of living", and to accomplish other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

(See joint resolution printed in full when presented on yesterday by Mr. DUFFY, p. 2817, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

Mr. LA FOLLETTE also presented a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, favoring the enactment of legislation to provide work for persons who have secured loans from the Home Owners' Loan Corporation and from other sources and who, because of unemployment, are unable to meet the required payments, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See joint resolution printed in full when presented on yesterday by Mr. DUFFY, p. 2817, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

Mr. NORBECK presented a resolution adopted by the city council of Mitchell, S. Dak., favoring the enactment of pending legislation proclaiming October 11 in each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. NORBECK also presented the following concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

House Concurrent Resolution 12

A concurrent resolution requesting and urging the Federal Government to acquire, set aside, preserve, and maintain as a national park a tract of land in Knox County, Nebr., locally known as the "Devil's Nest"

Be it resolved by the house of representatives of the twenty-fourth session (the senate concurring):

Whereas the tract of land in Knox County, Nebr., locally known as the "Devil's Nest" and described generally as follows:

"All of sections 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, in township 33 north, of range 3 west; also

"All of sections 3, 4, 5, 9, 10, and northeast quarter of section 6 and east half of section 8, in township 32 north, of range 3 west, all of said described lands being in the political subdivision of Knox County known as 'Herrick Township'; also

"All of sections 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 35, 36, and northeast quarter of section 33 and north half of section 34, in township 33 north, of range 4 west, all of said described lands being in the political subdivision of Knox County known as 'Santee Township'; also

"North half of section 1 and northeast quarter of section 2, in township 32 north, of range 4 west, Hill Township";

All real estate herein described is situated in the sixth principal meridian west, in Knox County, Nebr., including all accretion land to said described tract to the main channel of the Missouri River, naturally in all things fit to be established as a national park; and

Whereas if established as a national park, (a) it would be of great benefit to the people of the States of South Dakota and Nebraska; and (b) the public good from its establishment would far outweigh its cost; and (c) it would furnish a recreational playground, centrally located, for a large population; and (d) would furnish a needed game refuge for all migratory game birds and assure its being continued to be used as a natural feeding and resting grounds for wild ducks and geese and other migratory birds; and (e) would lend itself to wild-animal husbandry; and (f) having many natural springs and being within the artesian-well basin, a great number of small natural lakes could be formed therein, adaptable for game fish; and (h) being capable of growing forests of hard and soft wood, would aid in reforestation; and (i) be a monument in Nebraska to the Sioux Indian of the past and an aid to his future development: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of South Dakota (the senate concurring), That we respectfully request the Federal Government to acquire, set aside, preserve, and maintain said tract of land as a national park; be it further

Resolved, That our United States Senators and Representatives in Congress be requested to urge the passage of such legislation as may be necessary to bring about the establishment of said land as a national park and to do any other act essential to accomplish this purpose, and that the chief clerk of the house be, and he is hereby, instructed to forward a copy of this concurrent resolution to each of the Members of the South Dakota delegation in Congress.

Mr. NORBECK also presented the following concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs:

House Concurrent Resolution 8

A concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to appropriate moneys sufficient to pay and contribute a proportionate share for the maintaining of the public schools within the various school districts within this State wherein there is Government-owned or controlled lands.

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the Twenty-fourth Legislative Session of the State of South Dakota (the senate concurring):

Whereas the Federal Government, through its Department of Indian Affairs, has or is about to promulgate a policy of furnishing education to Indian children in the school districts in which they reside, thereby reducing the school census of said districts and materially reducing the tax revenue therein; and

Whereas the Federal Government likewise through its various rehabilitation centers, C. C. C. and veterans' camps, and through its proposed submarginal land-buying program, and other Federal projects, has or will acquire and take from the tax rolls large bodies of land in various portions of this State and will thereby cause an extra and enlarged tax burden to be placed upon privately owned lands for the purpose of maintaining the schools within the districts wherein said lands are located; and

Whereas it would create no appreciable burden on the Federal Government to reimburse said school districts for the revenue thereby lost: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be, and it is hereby, memorialized to forthwith appropriate moneys sufficient to pay and contribute to said school districts the revenues lost to them by reason of the acts of the Federal Government as hereinbefore set forth, and that said payments continue during all of the times hereafter while such conditions exist; be it further

Resolved, That certified copies of this resolution be presented to each Senator and Representative of the State of South Dakota in the Congress of the United States to be by them presented to the proper committee in Congress to determine such legislation.

Mr. NORBECK also presented the following concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce:

House Concurrent Resolution 9

A concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to take immediate and appropriate action to place all interstate commercial transportation by highway under Federal regulation

Whereas there is now no Federal regulation or interstate carriers for hire by highway and the public necessity existing for such regulation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of South Dakota (the senate concurring):

SECTION 1. That we hereby request and urge that the Congress of the United States take immediate and appropriate action to place all interstate commercial transportation by highway under Federal regulation.

Sec. 2. *Be it further resolved,* That a copy of this resolution be spread upon the journal of the house of representatives and that a copy thereof be forwarded to each of the Senators and Representatives from the State of South Dakota in the Congress of the United States.

Adopted January 29, 1935.

ADDITIONAL JUDGES IN CALIFORNIA

Mr. ASHURST presented a telegram from the Board of Governors of the Patent Law Association, of Los Angeles, Calif., which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Telegram]

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., March 5, 1935.

HON. HENRY F. ASHURST,

Chairman Senate Committee on the Judiciary,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

The Board of Governors of the Patent Law Association, of Los Angeles, strongly recommends that your committee act promptly on provision for additional judge for Circuit Court of Appeals, Ninth Circuit, and for two additional judges for southern district of California. Present congestion amounts to a denial of justice and leaves Federal Government with no adequate law-enforcement machinery in this district at a time when it is most urgently needed.

BOARD OF GOVERNORS, PATENT LAW ASSOCIATION,
OF LOS ANGELES.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. TYDINGS, from the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 707) to amend the act of May 19, 1926, entitled "An act to authorize the President to detail officers and enlisted men of the United States Army, Navy, and Marine Corps to assist the governments of the Latin American Republics in military and naval matters", reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 238) thereon.

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

S. 365. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Elmer E. Miller (Rept. No. 239);

S. 708. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the Velie Motors Corporation (Rept. No. 240);

S. 931. A bill for the relief of the Concrete Engineering Co. (Rept. No. 241); and

S. 1860. A bill for the relief of the Tampa Marine Co. (Rept. No. 242).

Mr. LOGAN also, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 1055) authorizing adjustment of the claim of Frank Spector, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 243) thereon.

He also, from the Committee on Mines and Mining, to which was referred the bill (S. 1432) to amend section 5 of the act of March 2, 1919, generally known as the "war minerals relief statutes", reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 249) thereon.

Mr. BAILEY, from the Committee on Claims, to which were referred the following bills, reported them each with an amendment and submitted reports thereon:

S. 28. A bill for the relief of R. B. Miller (Rept. No. 244); and

S. 925. A bill to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of William W. Danenhower (Rept. No. 245).

Mr. BAILEY also, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 148) for the relief of the estate of Donnie Wright, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 246) thereon.

Mr. GIBSON, from the Committee on Claims, to which were referred the following bills, reported them each with an amendment and submitted reports thereon:

S. 794. A bill for the relief of the Bowers Southern Dredging Co. (Rept. No. 248); and

S. 1863. A bill for the relief of Trifune Korac (Rept. No. 247).

Mr. BLACK, from the Committee on Finance, to which was referred the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 65) to extend the period of suspension of the limitation governing the filing of suit under section 19, World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 251) thereon.

Mr. DUFFY, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 1135) for the relief of Alice F. Martin, widow, and two minor children, reported it adversely and submitted a report (No. 252) thereon.

WORK-RELIEF PROGRAM—REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. GLASS. From the Committee on Appropriations, to which was recommitted the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 117) making appropriations for relief purposes, I report back the joint resolution favorably, with amendments, and I submit a report (No. 250) thereon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be placed on the calendar.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. MALONEY:

A bill (S. 2155) to grant relief to persons erroneously convicted in courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

A bill (S. 2156) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Chesapeake Bay between Baltimore and Kent Counties, Md.; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. FLETCHER:

A bill (S. 2157) granting an increase of pension to Lou Sutton; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BULKLEY:

A bill (S. 2158) for the relief of Franz J. Feinler; and

A bill (S. 2159) for the relief of Tom L. Taylor; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LA FOLLETTE:

A bill (S. 2160) for the relief of George C. Mansfield Co. and George D. Mansfield; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 2161) granting a pension to Mary Pratt (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. NYE:

A bill (S. 2162) to restore to Congress its constitutional power to issue money and regulate the value thereof; to provide for the orderly distribution of the abundance with which a beneficent Creator has blessed us; to establish and maintain the purchasing power of money at a fixed and equitable level; to restore the values of property to just and equitable levels; to increase the prices of agricultural products to a point where they will yield the cost of production plus a fair profit to the farmer; to provide a living and just annual wage which will enable every citizen willing to work and capable of working to maintain and educate his family on an increasing level or standard of living; to repay debts with dollars of equal value; to lift in part the burden of taxation; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. NORBECK:

A bill (S. 2163) for the relief of Harry T. Davison, Sr., and Emma E. D. Davison; to the Committee on Finance.

A bill (S. 2164) granting an increase of pension to George P. Benedict (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TYDINGS (by request):

A bill (S. 2165) to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act authorizing the Great Falls Bridge Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Potomac River at or near Great Falls", approved April 21, 1928; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

A bill (S. 2166) for the relief of Ludwig Larson (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2167) for the relief of Mrs. William E. Smith and Miss Clara Smith (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2168) for the relief of the Bell Telephone Co. of Pennsylvania (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 2169) for the relief of certain disbursing officers of the Army of the United States (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DICKINSON:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 76) relating to leave with pay for employees of the Government Printing Office; to the Committee on Printing.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolution were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated below:

H. R. 3808. An act to authorize the incorporated town of Seward, Alaska, to undertake certain municipal public works, including the construction of an electric generating station and electric distribution systems, and for such purposes to issue bonds in any sum not exceeding \$118,000; and

H. R. 6084. An act to authorize the city of Ketchikan, Alaska, to issue bonds in any sum not to exceed \$1,000,000 for the purpose of acquiring the electric light and power, water, and telephone properties of the Citizens' Light, Power & Water Co., and to finance and operate the same, and validating the preliminary proceedings with respect thereto, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 4751. An act to amend section 24 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, with respect to the terms of office of members of the Interstate Commerce Commission; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

H. J. Res. 134. Joint resolution to continue the Commission for Determining the Boundary Line Between the District of Columbia and the State of Virginia for not to exceed 1 addi-

tional year, and to authorize not to exceed \$10,000 additional funds for its expenses; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

On motion of Mr. McNARY, the Committee on Claims was discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 2097) conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear and determine claims of certain bands or tribes of Indians residing in the State of Oregon, and it was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

MARGARET A. SCOTT

Mr. HAYDEN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 93), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the appropriation for Miscellaneous items, contingent fund of the Senate, fiscal year 1934, to Margaret A. Scott, widow of Daniel U. Scott, late a laborer of the Senate under supervision of the Sergeant at Arms, a sum equal to 1 year's compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

INCREASE OF GREAT BRITAIN'S ARMAMENT BUDGET

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an article from this morning's edition of the New York Times relating to the decision of the British Government to increase its military budget as the result of the increase in the military budgets on the part of the United States and other governments. At a later time I shall have occasion to refer to this article and the action of the British Government.

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

[From the New York Times, Mar. 5, 1935]

BRITAIN TO INCREASE ARMS—LOSS OF FAITH IN PACTS SEEN—WHITE PAPER CITES THE GERMAN MENACE, WEAKNESS OF SECURITY TREATIES, AND REARMING OF JAPAN, RUSSIA, AND THE UNITED STATES

By Charles A. Selden

LONDON, March 4.—The British Government today announced a new defense policy. From this the only inference to be drawn is that it has no faith left in any of the various existing or contemplated pacts now pending for the peace or security of either Europe or Asia.

The new policy, presented in the House of Commons in the form of a White Paper signed only with Prime Minister J. Ramsay MacDonald's initials, sounds the knell of arms-reduction programs for this country. It calls for increases in the Army, Navy, and air forces.

The White Paper, being only a general statement of policy, contains no figures indicating to what extent the new policy will be implemented in the immediate future. Army estimates issued today, however, show an increase over last year of about 10 percent to a new total of £43,550,000 and an increase in personnel to 152,200 from 149,500. (The pound was quoted yesterday at \$4.77½.)

The air force estimates will follow tomorrow and those of the Navy Wednesday. Increases are also expected as a matter of course in both these forces, but they will not be sensational.

The new Army figures themselves were not so significant as the warlike tone of the statement from Viscount Halisham, Minister of War, that accompanied them. He was thoroughly in tune with the White Paper.

The chief needs of the Army now, he said, were further mechanization, new installation of coast defenses at home and abroad, expansion of antiaircraft defenses, and increase of ammunition and general stores. His references to coast defenses abroad chiefly concerned Singapore and Hong Kong.

"In the deliberate judgment of government," he declared, "the time has now arrived when action should be taken to bring our military preparations more up to date; and provision is included in these estimates for expenditure, material, and some increases in numbers as an installment of a program which will necessarily be spread over a period of years."

The Government must feel sure of itself, as far as domestic politics are concerned, for this new burst of Tory militarism voiced by a former Socialist Prime Minister stifles all hopes that there might be a reduction in the income tax in the April budget.

It is a direct challenge to the labor opposition to fight the next election on the peace issue. It files in the face of the popular peace ballot, which, with more than 2,000,000 votes already cast, shows 92 percent for arms reduction and 86 percent for abolition of military aircraft. It is in the air force that the new Government program provides for the largest increase.

Air force increases were promised by the Government last summer when Stanley Baldwin made his famous remark that the British frontier was no longer the chalk cliffs of Dover, but the Rhine. At that time it was announced that British military aviation strength would be augmented over a period of 5 years by

41 new squadrons, an increase in the number of fighting planes from 840 to 1,300.

Mr. Baldwin's remark on Britain's "new frontier" was supplemented in today's White Paper by the following:

RANGE OF ATTACKS EXPANDING

"The range of territory on the Continent of Europe from which air attacks would be launched against this country is constantly extending and will continue to extend. If in war an enemy were in possession of countries bordering on the Channel, the area of England liable to attack would be still further increased. For these reasons the importance of the integrity of certain territories on the other side of the Channel and the North Sea, which for centuries have been and still remain of vital interest to this country from a naval point of view, looms larger than ever when air defense also is taken into consideration."

The countries indicated above are, of course, Belgium, France, and The Netherlands.

No mention is made in the White Paper to Sir John Simon's visit to Berlin Thursday, but, after alluding to British charges made in the House of Commons on November 28 that Germany was illegally arming, today's document says:

"This rearmament, if continued at the present rate, unabated and uncontrolled, will aggravate the existing anxieties of Germany's neighbors and may consequently produce a situation where peace will be in peril."

"The British Government have noted and welcomed the declarations of leaders in Germany that they desire peace. We cannot, however, fail to recognize that not only their forces but the spirit in which the population, especially the youth, of their country are being organized, lend color to and substantiate the general feeling which has already been incontestably generated."

These are the parts of the White Paper which the Government's critics condemn tonight as a strange prelude to the Foreign Minister's visit this week on a mission of peace to Berlin. They are cited as evidence to support the suspicion that the recent Anglo-French agreement is not intended to bring Germany back to the collective system but to keep her out.

MOTION OF CENSURE LIKELY

There was no debate on the subject today, but there will be one next Monday. The nature of the opposition's attitude was foreshadowed today by George Lansbury, Labor leader, who referred to the White Paper as "most extraordinary and alarming."

The Labor opposition will probably offer a motion to censure the government because of this unlooked-for departure from its disarmament policy. The Liberals may join in the minority rebuke. The matter will be settled later in the week by the leaders of the two opposition groups.

The Government's critics all regard the program as most untimely and wonder why the announcement should have been made just 3 days before Foreign Secretary Sir John Simon's visit to Berlin.

Inasmuch as the Government document refers more specifically to Germany's rearming than to that of any other country, the White Paper is interpreted as meaning either that Sir John expects to accomplish nothing in Berlin or that some useful effect might follow a warning to Reichsfuehrer Adolf Hitler that Great Britain is now going to be as warlike as the rest of the world.

Britain's official justification for this new departure in general policy is that her good example in unilateral arms reduction has not been followed by other nations and that all the post-war collective peace efforts, in which she claims to have been a leader, have proved inadequate to bring security. The White Paper enumerates all these efforts, including the Kellogg-Briand Pact, the Locarno Treaty, the Disarmament Conference, the Washington and London Naval Treaties, the Pacific Pacts, and various other agreements, even including the Anglo-French arrangement of last month. Then it treats them all severally and collectively as insufficient to assure peace without an arms increase.

Relevant to the same point is the White Paper's reference to the fact that "the deterrent effect of the Locarno Treaties and of other methods of collective security is weakened by the knowledge that our contribution in time of need could have little decisive effect."

"The same consideration would, of course, apply to any other method of collective security to which we might be parties."

FACTS NO LONGER ADEQUATE

"Hitherto, despite many set-backs," says the White Paper, "public opinion in this country has tended to assume that nothing was required for the maintenance of peace except the existing international political machinery and that the older methods of defense—navies, armies, and air forces—on which we have hitherto relied, are no longer required. The force of world events, however, has shown this assumption to be premature, and we have far to go before we can find complete security without having in the background the means of defending ourselves against attack."

"Nations differ in their temperaments, needs, and state of civilization. Discontent may arise of various causes—from recollection of past misfortunes, from desire to recover past losses, of pressure occasioned by increase in population. All these are fruitful sources of friction and dispute, and events in various parts of the world have shown that nations are still prepared to use or threaten force under the impulse of what they conceive as national necessity."

"And it has been found that, once action has been taken, the existing international machinery for the maintenance of peace cannot be relied on as a protection against an aggressor."

UNITED STATES CITED AS ARMING

In this citing of bad examples from other parts of the world, the White Paper also mentions the United States.

"Nor is the increase in armaments confined to Germany," it asserted. "All over the world, in Russia, Japan, the United States, and elsewhere, armaments are being increased. We could not afford to overlook this, and so had to begin to meet our deficiencies. But we are anxious not to make our provisions for necessary defense merge into an armament race."

In that connection the Government says the new policy is elastic, so that if sudden peace should come to the world, this country could change its arms program.

With reference to naval policy, the statement is not surprising, because the British made it known last year in London conversations with Norman H. Davis, the United States Ambassador at Large, that this country was determined to increase her cruiser strength from 50 to 70. The White Paper seems to be based on the assumptions that there will be a naval conference this summer and that the British hope to get an agreement that will give her all the fleet she wants without starting a competition.

After rehearsing the familiar arguments that the security of the United Kingdom and all other parts of the Empire depends absolutely on the navy, the White Paper says:

"The main fleet is the basis upon which our naval strategy rests; but the cover it can provide is rarely complete and it may always be expected that detached enemy units may evade our main fleet and carry out sporadic attacks on territories and trade. To deal with these attacks, a considerable number of cruisers is required over and above those forming part of the main fleet."

CAPITAL SHIPS ESSENTIAL

"In the main fleet, the capital ship remains an essential element upon which the whole structure of our naval strategy depends. The age of our battleships renders it necessary to commence their replacement at an early date, but the extent of new construction will be subject to any agreement reached at the forthcoming naval conference. The advent of an air attack in the present form was foreseen when existing battleships were designed, but antiaircraft armament is being increased to enable them to perform their primary function."

"The strength of our Navy is now fixed by the Washington and London Naval Treaties, which are due for reconsideration this year. Divergences of national points of view have developed since the negotiation of those treaties, as evinced by the recent notice of Japan to terminate the Washington Treaty and by the program effected or contemplated by some European powers."

"It is the hope of His Majesty's Government to secure an arrangement that will avoid competition in naval armaments, while leaving us free to maintain our fleet at a strength necessary to our absolute requirements. This involves calculation of the number of ships of each type which together make up the fleet, and its essential minimum numbers so calculated should be maintained. It is equally essential that our fleet should be kept up-to-date in all respects, including a sufficient highly trained personnel; adequate provision for aircraft, which are becoming more and more important to the Navy; the most modern weapons, repair facilities, the necessary reserves and full ammunition stores of all kinds at convenient bases. Without these facilities, or if our ships are less well equipped than those of possible enemies, all the money spent will be wasted, as the ships cannot perform effectively their defensive functions."

THE NARCOTIC DRUG EVIL

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I ask that a series of addresses made in connection with the narcotic evil be inserted in the RECORD. As health commissioner of New York I became familiar with the evils of the traffic in narcotic drugs, and I am heartily in sympathy with the efforts being made to deal adequately with the problem. I am informed that the last in the series of broadcasts on this subject will be an address by the Attorney General of the United States.

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

BROADCAST OVER THE NATIONAL NETWORK FEBRUARY 27, 1935

The announcer said: "This is the fourth in a series of broadcasts under the auspices of the World Narcotic Defense Association, of which Admiral Richmond P. Hobson is president. The narcotic association is now carrying on a comprehensive campaign to secure adoption by all our States of a uniform law on narcotics."

"Today eminent narcotic authorities will discuss the general question of 'Law versus the narcotic drug evil.' Mr. Hayne Davis, vice president of the narcotic association, will conduct the broadcast and present the speakers."

Mr. Davis said: "The urgent need is to secure interstate accord on narcotics through adoption of the uniform narcotic drug act by all the States of our Union. You are privileged today to hear from the very highest authorities on this subject: The United States Commissioner of Narcotics, Mr. H. J. Anslinger; the president of the American Bar Association, Hon. Scott M. Loftin, of Florida; the president of the Bar Association in 1932, when that association endorsed the proposed uniform narcotic drug act, Hon. Clarence E. Martin, of West Virginia."

"The subject of the discussion is 'Law Versus the Narcotic Drug Evil.'"

"The first speaker is Mr. H. J. Anslinger, the able, faithful, and efficient United States Commissioner of Narcotics—the chief Federal official for enforcement of the national narcotic laws and treaties—Mr. Anslinger."

ADDRESS BY MR. H. J. ANSLINGER, UNITED STATES COMMISSIONER OF NARCOTICS

Opium has been a boon to mankind in alleviating suffering, but a terrible curse to those who have become victims to its abuse.

The hope of a practical solution lies in strict control of the production, sale, and distribution of narcotic drugs, as well as of the raw materials capable of use in the making of these drugs. Great progress has been made in these directions, and further progress is in prospect.

The first opium conference was the outcome of American initiative. Similar conferences, with wider scope, followed in due course, at The Hague in 1912, at Geneva in 1925 and 1931. The delegates assembled at these conferences from all parts of the world were appalled by the evidence of human wreckage and misery through the abuse of narcotics which was laid before them. They were alarmed also by proof that this evil was rapidly spreading throughout the world. Some of those who were thus enlightened as to the fact and extent of narcotic drug abuse, resolved to stamp out this evil, and at each conference they succeeded in securing general consent to some plans calculated to further this good purpose.

At the 1931 conference great strides were taken by agreement upon terms for effective limitation of the manufacture of narcotic drugs to the actual needs of mankind, for scientific and medicinal purposes, and for strict control of the drugs manufactured for these purposes so that none of them would find their way into the channels of illicit trade. The treaty evolved by that conference constitutes the most powerful blow that has thus far been dealt to the illicit narcotic traffic. This treaty is now the basis of international accord on narcotics. Indeed, the Limitation Treaty of 1931 may properly be called the Magna Carta of world freedom from the narcotic drug tyrant. Internationally, the allied forces in the warfare on the narcotic drug evil have achieved great victories, and are now consolidated in a strong position, well prepared for the next offensive. In the United States, however, there is weakness in the lines of defense against this enemy of all mankind.

"This is due not to willingness among our good people to let this evil have its way here but to the division of sovereign power between the Nation and the States composing the Union, and to the difficulties encountered in getting full information on the narcotic problem into the hands of the several thousand State legislators, who alone have power to enact the laws necessary for consolidating this country behind the National Government in the splendid position it has taken on narcotics. Long ago the Treasury Department took steps so far as it lawfully could to limit manufacture of narcotic drugs in the United States to the needs of this country for scientific and medicinal purposes. Its broad policy is to limit the importation of opium and coca leaves to the medical and scientific needs as determined by the United States Public Health Service, and to control manufacture and the distribution of the drugs made from the raw material so imported. This distribution is under effective control from importation of the raw material to delivery of the manufactured drug to the consumer. I know of no finer tribute to the control system of your National Government than one expressed by a delegate of Canada at a recent world narcotic conference. He said that the United States manufactures drugs for 120,000,000 people, and that there is a 3,000-mile border between the two countries, making smuggling comparatively simple, yet in all his experience he had never found narcotics of American manufacture in the illicit traffic in Canada, although he found large quantities of narcotics of European manufacture."

"Our entire field force does not exceed 300 officers for the whole United States, or 1 for each 400,000 of the population, and it can be readily seen that the ordinary police work of narcotic law enforcement, such as the detection and apprehension of the many petty street peddlers and the even greater number of those improperly possessing narcotics, cannot be adequately performed by Federal officers. State cooperation is essential to a reasonably adequate system of narcotic law enforcement, and the several States of the Union have a serious obligation to perform in doing their proper part in the suppression of this evil."

"The adoption of a uniform narcotic drug act by all the States will do away with the existing weaknesses in our narcotic laws by giving to the people of the United States and of each State as good protection against the narcotic evil as can be secured through legislative action, will enable the authorities of the States to cooperate more effectively with each other and with the officials of the National Government, and will be a great aid to the United States in properly fulfilling its part in combatting the narcotic evil in those phases which can be dealt with effectively only through international cooperation. We obligated ourselves to control production of opium under The Hague Convention of 1912. We can fulfill that obligation under this State legislation."

Mr. Davis said:

"Thank you, Mr. Commissioner."

"No one knows better than Mr. Anslinger what the present law on narcotics is and what that law ought to be."

"Members of the bar who have been recognized by their colleagues as worthy of election to the presidency of the American Bar Association are certainly qualified to plead the cause of law versus the narcotic drug evil before the supreme court of public opinion. You will now hear the views of Hon. Scott M. Loftin, of Florida, president of the American Bar Association, regarding the uniform narcotic drug act. Mr. Loftin found it impossible to be here today, so I shall read a message received from him.

"MESSAGE FROM HON. SCOTT M. LOFTIN, OF FLORIDA

"It has long been customary for the Governors of the several States to appoint commissioners on uniform State laws to confer with one another on those questions, in which uniformity in the laws of the States is deemed to be for the best interests of the people. The Forty-second Annual Conference of these Commissioners on Uniform State Laws, held in 1932, formulated a comprehensive program of legislation on the narcotic problem, which is commonly known as the "uniform narcotic drug act." The American Bar Association held its meeting for that year soon after this act was approved by the conference of commissioners. The act came very appropriately, therefore, before the Bar Association for consideration at its 1932 session.

"The Honorable Clarence E. Martin was president of the Bar Association that year, and he was also a member of the Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws, which formulated this act. He is especially well qualified, therefore, to explain in detail how the adoption of this act by all the States will promote the welfare of the American people. As President of the American Bar Association, I content myself, therefore, with saying that there is no member of our association better qualified than Mr. Martin to demonstrate the present need for adoption of this act by all of our State legislatures. In addition, I am saying a few words more as a citizen of the State of Florida. The proposed uniform narcotic drug act was adopted by the Florida Legislature in May 1933, and the people of Florida were benefited substantially and immediately.

"The Jacksonville Journal, in its issue of October 27, 1933, carried a strong editorial concerning the uniform narcotic drug act, entitled 'The Workings of a Good Law' and worded as follows:

"Few enactments of the 1933 legislature were more significant in purpose or sounder in design than the uniform State narcotic law.

"Occasion for reflection in this regard was presented by the important marijuana arrest and seizure here last week.

"The sale on which the case was made involved 2 pounds of the dried weed prepared for smoking.

"Subsequent investigations led to a larger seizure and the discovery that the plant from which the drug is made has been grown inside the city limits of Jacksonville.

"First among the points to be noted is that the case could not have been made prior to the passage of the uniform State law. The Harrison Act applies only to opium and coca leaves and their derivatives.

"In the second place, the case affords illustration of the integration of enforcement agencies under the new law. It resulted from the conjoint efforts of Federal, State, and city forces.

"Again, it properly relegates the prosecution of such crime to local courts set up for handling of local problems. The Federal Bureau of Narcotics is left free to exercise its major function of controlling medical movements and smuggling.

"Eight of the 24 cases made here strictly under the uniform law have been tried and eight convictions have been returned.

"Scheduled for trial are two types of cases not covered previously. One doctor's license is up for revocation and several addicts will be prosecuted for obtaining narcotics under false pretenses.

"Revocation of medical licenses and restriction of drug issue through misrepresentation by addicts were not provided for in former laws.

"Through the closing up of loopholes and the coordination of existing regulatory agencies, the new uniform State law places that control upon a higher basis of intelligence and efficiency.

"Florida is in the vanguard of States adopting it."

"I conclude by saying that, in my opinion, all of the States should adopt the uniform narcotic drug act, so as to effectively cooperate with the Federal Government in its war against the illegal drug traffic, and, I will add, so as to secure for the people of each State the protection which we in Florida now enjoy through the adoption of this act in 1933.

"SCOTT M. LOFTIN,
President American Bar Association."

Mr. Davis then said: "Here you have proof from experience, brief but convincing. And after hearing these words of Mr. Loftin, president of the American Bar Association, in regard to the qualifications of Hon. Clarence E. Martin, of West Virginia, that gentleman needs no further introduction. Mr. Martin."

ADDRESS OF HON. CLARENCE E. MARTIN, OF WEST VIRGINIA, FORMER PRESIDENT OF THE AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION

"The World Narcotic Defense Association is engaged in the public-spirited effort of backing every good movement and plan for controlling narcotics, so that they will not be used to the detriment of mankind. So effective has this world-wide movement been elsewhere, that the eyes of the world are now turned toward America in this fight to prevent the illegal and immoral use of narcotic drugs. We are compelled to accept the challenge and

measure up to, if not surpass, the standard set in other parts of the civilized world.

"Representatives of nearly all the nations met at Geneva in 1931 and formulated a convention for limiting the manufacture and regulating the distribution of narcotic drugs. This convention was submitted by President Hoover to the Senate on March 4, 1932, and on March 31, 1932, was unanimously ratified by the Senate.

"The uniform narcotic drug act is an outgrowth of efforts on the part of the American Bar Association to secure the passage of uniform statutes on subjects of State legislation, where modern conditions require this through the Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws, composed of three or more commissioners or delegates from each State. These men are supposed to be outstanding lawyers in their respective States and meet annually for a week to deliberate upon proposed uniform statutes.

"A proposed uniform statute is not finally adopted until it is discussed by five or more sessions of the conference. Great care is taken to make the model statute cover all phases of the subject and to be as near perfect as is humanly possible. In addition, before final recommendation to the States for action, these proposed laws must be approved by the American Bar Association.

"In this manner, under modern conditions of society, the sovereignty of the States is being preserved and the perpetuity of our dual system of government insured. The uniform narcotic drug act, now before the legislatures of the many States, is the work of the Conference of Commissioners, having been completed and adopted in 1932. It is the result of 5 years' work by the committee in charge, and by experts connected with various organizations and associations, which were and are interested in the subject. In drafting this act, which covers not alone a social but also an economic problem, it was essential to determine the legal use of narcotic drugs and to protect that use, and to fix what is to be illegal use and provide punishments therefor.

"Consideration had to be given to the various functions of manufacturers, wholesalers, retailers, druggists, doctors, dentists, nurses, and others. The committee in charge of drafting the act was compelled to familiarize itself with the medical effects of the various drugs as well as other phases of the problem. This gives you an idea of the conference and of its method of formulating the uniform narcotic drug act. The following enumeration of outstanding points will give an idea of its scope and purpose. The act makes it unlawful to manufacture, possess, prescribe, administer, dispense, or compound any narcotic drug, save in conformity with the provisions of the act; requires manufacturers and wholesalers to have a State license; compels applicant for license to be of good moral character (and if a corporation the officers must be of such character) and be possessed of proper land, buildings, and all paraphernalia needed for carrying on such business; authorizes officials who grant licenses to suspend or revoke them for cause; limits the manufacturer or wholesaler in the sale of the product; forbids sale by apothecaries, except on written prescriptions, which cannot be refilled, and provides for registration of the name of the purchaser and character of the drug bought; regulates administration of drugs by physicians, dentists, veterinarians, with requirements for return of unused portion to the doctor when it is no longer necessary for the patient; limits the amount that can be lawfully sold, so as to keep all purchases within the bounds of medicine and science; restricts the cultivation of raw materials capable of being used in the manufacture of narcotic drugs, so as to keep the quantity down to the actual needs of our people for medical and scientific purposes; covers, in fact, every phase of the problem, with all loopholes for improper use closed up and every safeguard for proper use provided.

"The act is, in brief, a common-sense treatment of a present-day problem, every effort being made to prevent improper acquisition or use of the narcotic drug, from the time of its manufacture down to its actual good and proper use, or to its destruction as provided in the act, when not put to proper use. As to attempted improper use, may I elaborate?

"According to the uniform crime reports for the United States and its possessions for the year 1934, issued by the United States Department of Justice, the age trend of law violators is going downward instead of upward.

"First. All lawful manufacturers, dealers, doctors, and others will know and understand the law relative thereto and will not be compelled to attempt to ascertain, and then to comply with the meaning of various State statutes having many different and conflicting provisions, as at present.

"Second. There can be cooperation in enforcement among all of the agencies of justice of the States and of the Federal Government.

"Third. All obligations of the United States under the narcotic convention will be fully discharged.

"The States are what we make them. They are as strong, and as strong only, as the men who make, interpret, and administer their laws and conduct their affairs. It is essential for the very preservation of our form of government that there be proper and timely action by the States upon major social problems. By the adoption of this uniform narcotic drug act by all our States we of this day not only fulfill our international obligations on narcotics, but we perform a duty we owe to society here at home and make a complete answer to those who believe that local self-government is a failure.

"It is in this spirit that all persons are asked to urge their legislators to give serious consideration to and secure the passage of the uniform narcotic drug act by their own State."

WAR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. COPELAND. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the War Department appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5913) making appropriations for the military and nonmilitary activities of the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, and for other purposes.

Mr. McNARY. I appeal to the Senator from New York to let us at this time take a recess until tomorrow.

Mr. COPELAND. I shall be very happy to have the Senate take a recess now and proceed with the bill tomorrow.

RECESS

Mr. ROBINSON. I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 6, 1935, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 5 (legislative day of Mar. 4), 1935

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY

TO BE CAPTAIN

Stephen B. McKinney

TO BE COMMANDER

Greene W. Dugger, Jr.

TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDERS

John E. Dingwell
Emil Chourre
George T. Campbell
Hubert K. Stubbs
John B. McGovern
Elmer J. Tiernan
William N. Thornton
Albert McI. Wright
Charles R. Will
Jackson R. Tate
John F. Wegforth
James M. Fernald
William B. Coleman
Benjamin C. Purrington
Harold J. Walker
James H. Foskett

Anton L. Mare
Laurence Bennett
Sumner C. Cheever
Horatio G. Sickel, 4th
Raymond W. Holsinger
Virgil E. Kornis
Edmund T. Wooldridge
Charles B. Momsen
Marcy M. Dupre, Jr.
Edgar P. Kranzfelder
Elwood M. Tillson
Alva J. Spriggs
Norman R. Hitchcock
Daniel F. Worth, Jr.
Lemuel P. Padgett, Jr.

TO BE LIEUTENANTS

Hugh B. McLean	Stanley P. Moseley
Richard S. Moss	John H. Long
William L. Erdmann	Paul A. Hartzell
John M. Sweeney	David R. Hull
Frederick J. Ilsemann	James A. McNally
Lewis E. Coley	John R. van Nagell
Joseph J. Woodward	Bruce D. Kelly
Harold B. Edgar	Stirling P. Smith
Joshua C. Shively	Jeane R. Clark
Arthur B. Dickie	Horace W. Blakeslee
Charles L. Lee	Chester C. Smith
George Edward Peterson	George C. Wright
Henry Plander	Homer O. Dahlke
Clifton G. Grimes	Robert H. Gibbs
Victor D. Long	DeVere L. Day
Philip S. Creasor	Clarence E. Haugen
Frederick K. Loomis	Kenneth V. Dawson
Paul W. Hord	

TO BE LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

James D. Grant
Hepburn A. Pearce

TO BE PASSED ASSISTANT SURGEON

Leland J. Belding

TO BE PAYMASTERS

Charles E. Leavitt	Carl W. Seitz
Harrison W. McGrath	Cyrus B. Kitchen
Josephus M. Lieber	Charles D. Kirk
Charles W. Fox	Walter W. Mahany
William H. Phillips	John H. Davis
Lamar Lee	David W. Robinson
Andrew C. Shiver	

TO BE CHIEF GUNNERS

Clarence W. White
Gardner J. Douglass

TO BE CHIEF MACHINISTS

Joseph A. Oehlers
Sam B. Ezell

MARINE CORPS

John H. Russell to be major general.
Richard P. Williams to be brigadier general.
Thomas Holcomb to be brigadier general.
Charles F. B. Price to be colonel.
Karl I. Buse to be lieutenant colonel.
Donald J. Kendall to be major.
Lewis B. Reagan to be major.
Lawrence R. Kline to be captain.
William W. Paca to be captain.
Shelton C. Zern to be captain.
John E. Curry to be captain.
Louis C. Plain to be first lieutenant.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

Oscar Mikkelsen to be passed assistant dental surgeon.
Mark E. Bowers to be passed assistant dental surgeon.

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Robert E. Bowdon, Jr., Calera.
Clarence C. Calhoun, Jackson.
Henry G. Sockwell, Tuscumbia.
Edgar A. Tatum, Valley Head.
Alma Cardwell, Vredenburgh.

CALIFORNIA

Clayborne L. Boren, Bell.
Lela Opal Houghton, Newhall.
George H. Gischel, Tracy.
John J. Madigan, Vallejo.

GEORGIA

Herman E. Malaier, Chattahoochee.

ILLINOIS

Chrystal W. Beckett, Golden.
Clem Wiser, Martinsville.
Cora G. Rutherford, Medora.
Milton O. Harriss, Pinckneyville.
Alfred H. Barrow, Roodhouse.

KANSAS

William L. Brumbaugh, Portis.

MAINE

Walter E. Hurd, Berwick.
Mollie M. Armstrong, Cape Cottage.
John H. Gilbert, Monson.
Grover Cheney, Wells.

MONTANA

Mary A. Fetterman, Saco.

NEVADA

Elva I. Hermansen, East Ely.
Cyrus E. Hutton, Ruth.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Frank J. Young, Hinsdale.

NORTH DAKOTA

Peter Meier, Napoleon.
Julius C. Pfeifer, Richardton.
Emma Kittelson, San Haven.

OREGON

Harold R. White, Wasco.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Paul M. Davis, Donalds.

John H. Payne, Johnston.

Helen DuPre Moseley, Spartanburg.

VIRGINIA

Rosalie H. Mahone, Amherst.

E. LeRoy Smith, Appomattox.

Lavone A. Baker, Cartersville.

Dewey Arrington, Cleveland.

Robert B. Spencer, Dillwyn.

James F. Walker, Fort Defiance.

WASHINGTON

Marie L. Wenberg, East Stanwood.

Gladys E. Gillmore, Medical Lake.

Tolaver T. Richardson, Northport.

Andrew J. Cosser, Port Angeles.

Clifford L. Thomas, Sumas.

M. Berta Start, Winslow.

WISCONSIN

Dey E. Clemons, Brule.

James W. Harkin, Shullsburg.

Blanche Delany, Sinsinawa.

Alice M. Clinton, Sullivan.

WYOMING

George J. Snyder, Glendo.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MARCH 5, 1935

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Almighty God, we look up to Thy throne of mercy with thanksgiving and praise. Thy benefactions are like a goodly river that flows in soft and gentle radiance through the fields of our lives. In faith may we be dedicated to our ideals and be true to our immortal convictions. Heavenly Father, crown us with that soul power that keeps looking upward to the open skies. Hasten the day, speed the hour when industry shall rejoice and labor be glad and every man shall sit under his own vine and fig tree. O may Dives and Lazarus soon come together, heart to heart, and each claim the privilege of carrying the heavier burden. Keep before us the unveiled heavenly hills where the great ones of earth stand clothed in the light eternal and where we hope to rest some day and unfurl the signal of victory. In our Redeemer's name. Amen.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

S. 147. An act to alter the amount apportioned to certain States for public employment offices affiliated with the United States Employment Service;

S. 209. An act for the relief of Carmine Sforza;

S. 236. An act for the relief of the heirs of Burton Stearns Adams, deceased;

S. 243. An act for the relief of Curtis Jett;

S. 279. An act to extend the time for the refunding of certain taxes erroneously collected from certain building-and-loan associations;

S. 428. An act authorizing adjustment of the claim of Korber Realty, Inc.;

S. 535. An act for the relief of William Cornwell and others;

S. 537. An act for the relief of C. O. Meyer;

S. 713. An act granting jurisdiction to the Court of Claims to hear the case of David A. Wright;

S. 741. An act for the relief of the Union Shipping & Trading Co., Ltd.;

S. 743. An act to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the claim of the Morse Dry Dock & Repair Co.;

S. 857. An act to authorize the Department of Labor to continue to make special statistical studies upon payment of the cost thereof, and for other purposes;

S. 872. An act for the allowance of certain claims for extra labor above the legal day of 8 hours at the several navy yards and shore stations certified by the Court of Claims;

S. 937. An act for the relief of the J. M. Dooley Fireproof Warehouse Corporation, of Brooklyn, N. Y.;

S. 998. An act to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of George Lawley & Son Corporation, of Boston, Mass.;

S. 1037. An act authorizing adjustment of the claims of Sanford A. McAlister and Eliza L. McAlister;

S. 1038. An act authorizing adjustment of the claim of Elda Geer;

S. 1056. An act authorizing adjustment of the claim of Schutte & Koerting Co.;

S. 1180. An act to amend section 4865 of the Revised Statutes, as amended;

S. 1266. An act for the relief of Robert E. Masters;

S. 1360. An act for the relief of Teresa de Prevost;

S. 1392. An act conferring upon the United States District Court for the northern district of California, southern division, jurisdiction of the claim of Minnie C. de Back against the Alaska Railroad;

S. 1472. An act for the relief of the First Camden National Bank & Trust Co., of Camden, N. J.;

S. 1694. An act for the relief of C. B. Dickinson; and

S. J. Res. 21. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim October 11 of each year General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski.

SOPHIE DE SOTA

Mr. RUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of a concurrent resolution which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Concurrent Resolution 14

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, requested to return to the House of Representatives the enrolled bill H. R. 330, entitled "An act for the relief of Sophie de Sota."

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

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, as I understand, this pertains to the spelling of a word?

Mr. RUDD. That is all.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I read an article in the Post this morning much to my astonishment and with some amusement. I refer to its portrayal of the consideration of the "clerk-hire bill" yesterday. The article stated that it was a victory for the Democratic leadership. As I remember the exact wording, it stated, "The Democratic leadership cracked the whip and emerged victorious" to the tune of 242 to 146.

Mr. Speaker, let us look at the facts. If I remember correctly, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WARREN] told me the other day when I propounded a question to him that this bill was brought in because the Democratic steering committee requested that it be presented to the House. In looking over the record vote that was cast, I find there were only four or five Republicans who voted for the bill.