

To be lieutenant commanders

John M. Field, jr.
Clinton H. Havill.

To be lieutenants

Herman B. R. Jorgensen. John W. Jamison.
Clarence L. Hayward. Llewellyn J. Johns.
Raymond D. Tarbuck. Roscoe L. Bowman.

To be lieutenants (junior grade)

John M. McIsaac. John W. Price, jr.
Thomas E. Kelly. Ralph W. D. Woods.

To be medical directors

Perceval S. Rossiter.
Frank E. Sellers.

To be medical inspectors

George R. W. French.
Claude W. Carr.

To be surgeon

John F. Hart.

To be dental surgeons

Joseph A. Mahoney.
Marion E. Harrison.
John W. Crandall.

To be paymaster

Frederick C. Beck.

To be civil engineer

Charles R. Johnson.

To be chief machinists

Thomas G. Powers.
Frederick W. Sievert.

To be chief pay clerks

Allison A. Brock. Stanley A. Mann.
Raymond V. Christmas. Stanley C. King.
Floyd L. Chapman.

POSTMASTERS

ARIZONA

Ruth L. Streett, Warren.

GEORGIA

Martha C. Aultman, Byron.
James P. Rose, Lyerly.
David M. McKee, Moultrie.
E. Stella Barrett, Union City.

IOWA

Susana F. O'Bryan, Lovilia.
Jennie M. Thomsen, Royal.

MARYLAND

John S. Dean, North East.

MASSACHUSETTS

Berton Williams, Ayer.
Harry T. Downes, Hanover.
Frederick H. Buckley, Natick.

MICHIGAN

Chauncey A. Harris, Pontiac.

MINNESOTA

William C. Wiench, Bagley.
Henry H. Lukken, Boyd.
Edwin Mattson, Breckenridge.
Thomas R. Ohnstad, Cannon Falls.
John R. Forsythe, Cohasset.
Wilson W. Wright, Cromwell.
Gustav C. Wollan, Glenwood.
Gustaf A. Johnson, Hallock.
Kate M. Shubert, Hastings.
Charles F. Mallahan, Jackson.
Edward Odberg, Kettle River.
Anna Kockelman, Kilkenny.
Gustav O. Schlick, Lucan.
Carl W. Carlson, Melrose.
John L. Beck, Mountain Iron.
George L. Chesley, Pipestone.
Norman Hanson, Renville.
John P. Grothe, Roseau.
Arthur C. Omholt, Sacred Heart.
Henry C. Megrund, Shelly.
John Schmelz, Springfield.
Mae A. Lovestrom, Stephen.
Axel M. Croonquist, Stillwater.
Daniel Shaw, Thief River Falls.
Alfred Anderson, Twin Valley.

John P. Paulson, Two Harbors.
Olaf E. Reiersgard, Ulen.
Almer B. Nelson, Warren.
Frank H. Wherland, Welcome.

MISSISSIPPI

Prentice O'Rear, Columbus.
Willie Ramsey, Drew.
Louis B. Phillips, Eupora.
Nettie Ditsworth, Lucedale.
Allene M. Mitchell, Sunflower.
Walter L. Collins, Union.
Thomas C. Kite, Weir.
William W. Cain, West.

NEBRASKA

Vernon D. Hill, Diller.
Harry C. Haverly, Hastings.
Lottie B. Trumble, Hazard.
Verne W. Langford, Laurel.
Frederick Nielsen, Lexington.
Frederick H. Davis, Madison.
James W. Holmes, Plattsmouth.
Charles T. Gammon, Rushville.
Harry S. Prouty, Spencer.
Harvey A. Loerch, Tekamah.

NEW JERSEY

Alfred J. Perkins, Atlantic City.
Richard Watt, Garwood.
Frederick C. Docker, Oxford.
Harry Simmons, Rahway.

NEW MEXICO

Emma A. Coleman, Lovington.
Charles B. Thacker, Raton.
Chester G. Parsons, Wagon Mound.

NEW YORK

Harrison D. Todd, Arkville.
Walter L. Bibbey, Fort Edward.
Sumter L. Happy, Mount Vernon.
Harry T. Nowlan, Newark Valley.
William A. Baldwin, Norwich.
Carroll F. Simpson, Phoenicia.
Earl J. Conger, Waterville.

NORTH CAROLINA

Vernon W. Faris, Henderson.

OHIO

Charles F. Decker, Vermillion.
Wilbur C. Ledman, Zanesville.

PENNSYLVANIA

James C. Whitby, Bryn Mawr.
James D. Scott, Coatesville.
Earl H. Hilgert, Cresco.
George R. Fleming, Haverford.
Robert H. Stickler, Lansford.
Edgar Matthews, sr., Royersford.
Jennie Sutfon, Worthington.

WISCONSIN

Grace E. Skinner, Endeavor.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate February 9, 1927

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

William J. Tilson to be United States district judge, middle district of Georgia.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, February 9, 1927

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

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

Eternal God, source of every joy and the inspiration of every earth-born hope, well may Thy praise our lips employ. We bless Thee that our lives, so mercifully preserved, still hold the freshness of Thy love. This day interpret to us again Thy ways of righteousness and truth. How we do thank Thee that Thy mercy is big enough to cover all sin, to heal all wounds, and to comfort all sorrow. While we may draw the future near and dream of a better day, may we be grateful for the good that

is here. In every situation help us to show moral self-control and have a very deep sense of our trusteeship. May opportunity, privilege, or any earthly honor never spoil us. Through Christ, our Savior. Amen.

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

WAR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 16249) making appropriations for the military and nonmilitary activities of the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 16249, with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference. Is there objection?

There was no objection; and the Chair announced, as the conferees on the part of the House, Mr. BARBOUR, Mr. CLAGUE, Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa, Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky, and Mr. HARRISON.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from California whether he has consulted with the conferees on this side of the House?

Mr. BARBOUR. Not yet. This is merely to disagree to the Senate amendments and go into conference. I have not seen either of the conferees for several days.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. I give notice and insist that in fairness to the minority side, the majority side hereafter, when asking to go to conference, shall be able to state that they have advised with the members of the minority. I give notice now that unless you follow that suit you will not go to conference in respect to any of these bills. It is only reasonable to state, when this authority is given, that the minority members have been consulted with.

Mr. BARBOUR. I talked with the minority members about going to conference, but not about asking for unanimous consent at this particular time.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. What I have insisted on, I think, would be good practice.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Texas desire to object?

Mr. GARNER of Texas. No; I have no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Craven, its principal clerk, announced that the Senate had passed Senate bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 5082. An act authorizing the appropriation of \$8,600,000 for the purchase of seed grain, feed, and fertilizer to be supplied to farmers in the crop-failure areas of the United States, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 5197) to authorize an appropriation for reconnaissance work in conjunction with the middle Rio Grande conservancy district to determine whether certain lands of the Cochiti, Santo Domingo, San Felipe, Santa Ana, Sandia, and Isleta Indians are susceptible of reclamation, drainage, and irrigation.

The message also announced that the Vice President appointed Mr. DALE and Mr. MCKELLAR members of the Joint Select Committee on the part of the Senate as provided for in the act of February 16, 1889, as amended by the act of March 2, 1895, entitled "An act to authorize and provide for the disposition of useless papers in the executive departments," for the disposition of useless papers in the office of the United States Civil Service Commission.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. CAMPBELL, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following title, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 15959. An act making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11601. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors, etc.; and

S. 5197. An act to authorize an appropriation for reconnaissance work in conjunction with the middle Rio Grande conservancy district to determine whether certain lands of the

Cochiti, Santo Domingo, San Felipe, Santa Ana, Sandia, and Isleta Indians are susceptible of reclamation, drainage, and irrigation.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

Under clause 2, Rule XXIV, Senate bill of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and referred as indicated below:

S. 5082. An act authorizing the appropriation of \$8,600,000 for the purchase of seed grain, feed, and fertilizer to be supplied to farmers in the crop-failure areas of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE OF THE HOUSE

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege of the House and offer a resolution, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That a respectful message be sent to the Senate calling the attention of the Senate to the remarks of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BAYARD] found in the proceedings of the Senate for February 8, 1927, with the request that such action be taken by the Senate as will eliminate from the RECORD such remarks as are in violation of proper parliamentary practice and the proper comity existing between the two Houses.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, the remarks in question, in my judgment, constitute an attack upon the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. HOUSTON] that is not in accordance with proper comity between the Houses, and further, it questions the entire Republican membership of the House. I do not care to discuss the remarks. I have endeavored in the resolution which I have submitted, to frame it in such a way as to be entirely in keeping with the proper practice between the Houses, and am simply calling the remarks to the attention of the Senate for such action as that body may take. The remarks referred to occur on page 3256, at the top of the second column.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, may we have the resolution again reported?

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the resolution offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That a respectful message be sent to the Senate calling the attention of the Senate to the remarks of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BAYARD], found in the proceedings of the Senate for February 8, 1927, with the request that such action be taken by the Senate as will eliminate from the RECORD such remarks as are in violation of proper parliamentary practice and the proper comity existing between the two Houses.

Mr. CRAMTON. I will state, Mr. Speaker, that I have not consulted with the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. HOUSTON], for the reason that I feel he is perfectly capable of taking care of himself in the House and elsewhere and do not desire he should be responsible for my action. But I have felt that this is a matter concerning the House, and my action is with the view to the House preserving its dignity.

The SPEAKER. To what particular language does the gentleman refer?

Mr. CRAMTON. I have specially in mind the idea that the speech can have but one effect, and that is to stand as an attack upon the gentleman from Delaware. That becomes especially apparent in the portion beginning at the bottom of the first column on page 3256 continuing to the end of his remarks. So far as the House itself is concerned, and the Republican membership generally, I should perhaps read that paragraph, beginning:

Mr. President, what does that mean?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. What the gentleman reads will go again into the RECORD.

Mr. CRAMTON. It will no doubt be sufficient, and I will avoid that by indicating what appears at the bottom of column 1, page 3256.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. If the gentleman will permit me, I will say I have read the remarks of which the gentleman from Michigan proposes to complain to the Senate.

I understand it to be the rule of comity between the bodies that attacks or criticisms shall not be made of a Member of one body by a Member of the other. The reason for that is that it tends to lead to acrimonious discussion between the two bodies and is likely eventually to create a bad state of feeling between the two bodies that will not be conducive to satisfactory relations between the legislative branches.

I know nothing whatever of the merits involved in this question and I know nothing whatever of the controversy. The resolution of the gentleman is couched in the usual respectful terms we use in resolutions of that sort.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

FOREIGN-DEBT SETTLEMENTS

The SPEAKER. Under the order of the House, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] for 15 minutes.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, this is the day set by the Congress for the termination of the authority of the World War Foreign Debt Commission. Five years ago to-day that commission was created by an act of Congress. They negotiated during the past five years with more than 13 different countries and have adjusted and settled practically all these difficult debt problems, with what success the Members of the House know and appreciate. We are proud of the high devotion to duty shown by the members of this commission, and we have the right to be proud of the fact that the distinguished and venerable gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] and the equally distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] have ably represented this House on that commission [applause], and through their great abilities and by adopting that spirit of conciliation, of fair-dealing, and of justice, which has always characterized their public careers, they have made it possible for the United States of America to consummate these debts in a friendly and magnanimous manner with our foreign debtors.

But, unfortunately, gentlemen, there are those in this country and abroad who would have the United States Government—the President, the Debt Funding Commission, and the Congress—held up as a Shylock demanding the pound of flesh, and I rise at this time not only to voice the gratitude of the House and of all the American people for the splendid services of our colleagues, Messrs. BURTON and CRISP, and to say, "Well done, good and faithful servants," but to answer the charges that have recently been made by a group of Columbia professors attacking the agreements made by the Congress and asking that those agreements be revised and that these debts be canceled and also to answer at the same time the statement made by the distinguished commanding officer, General O'Ryan, of the Twenty-seventh New York Division, who said in a speech in Chicago on armistice day that he was ashamed of the way the Congress has settled these debts with foreign nations.

It is high time we answered these unfounded charges and emphasize the fact that the Congress, in settling these debts, exhibited the greatest amount of generosity and liberality that has ever been shown in the history of the world. [Applause.]

There are some 20,000 or more Legionnaires going over to Paris next September to attend the American Legion convention and I want those veterans of the World War to go there with their heads up, knowing the facts and not ashamed of the acts of Congress and of their own Government. [Applause.]

Now, let us see what we are supposed to be ashamed of. We canceled 53 per cent of the French war debt and we have only asked from France that amount of money which we loaned France after the armistice, but in spite of that—I see the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP], members of the commission, present, and I hope they will correct any statement I make which may not be strictly accurate—we have been held up to the world as a harsh and hard-hearted creditor. I am informed on good authority that French politicians permitted France to be placarded from one end to the other with the statement that only 5 per cent of the war debt had been canceled by the United States of America. No wonder there is bad feeling; no wonder there is confusion and misunderstanding among the French people—our traditional friends—as to the generous attitude of our country; no wonder there have been attacks and ridicule on the French stage and in the French press, depicting us as Shylock demanding the pound of flesh.

We went into this war not because it was our war. We were not responsible for causing the World War. There are those in France who claim that Poincare, Isvoisky, Russian ambassador to France, and other Russian and French militarists helped bring on the war, but the majority sentiment is that the German and Austrian militaristic clique caused the war. However, one thing is certain, and that is we were not a contributing factor in bringing about the World War, and there is no reason for the United States of America to be the only one to cancel

all war debts and to give away \$10,000,000,000 belonging to American taxpayers for war loans made in good faith.

We went into the war because our ships were attacked by the ruthless militaristic and autocratic machine that ruled Germany. We went in to protect our rights, and we contributed in blood and treasure to turn the tide of defeat into victory. [Applause.] And when the victory was won we asked for no conquered territory, for no plunder, for no indemnity, and for scarcely enough reparations to pay for our army of occupation. We asked for nothing and we got just what we asked, nothing at all. So, my friends, we have not a single thing to be ashamed of. [Applause.] In the entire history of the world there has never been a case of such unparalleled generosity as has been shown by the United States of America. [Applause.]

It is time that these round-robins, issued by Columbia professors—who should be attending to the instruction of their pupils instead of trying to instruct Congress—should cease. If they want to attempt to instruct Congress let them ascertain the truth and the exact facts before they issue such absurd manifestos to the American public. The main trouble which results from these unwarranted attacks upon the established policy of our Government in settling the war debts is to deceive the French people and make France think we are about to cancel the entire war debt. These attacks are not doing so much harm to America, but they are doing irreparable harm to the French people and to the French Government. [Applause.]

If, for example, the French Government, or even the English Government, want to revise these debts downward let us suggest to them that they appraise their possessions in the Caribbean Sea and offer those possessions to us, not at the appraised valuation, but at ten times the valuation, and do you think France or England will give up one of those islands?

Do you think France or England will give up any of their conquered territory in Mesopotamia or Africa? No. All that the debtor nations want is that America, who came in and turned the tide of defeat into victory, should carry the entire expense of the war from the date of our entry and that the \$10,000,000,000 lent by the American taxpayers should be canceled and America permitted to carry that burden in addition to over twenty billions expended by our own Government to help win the war. That is all there is to the European point of view. There is no other; and they will not be satisfied until these debts are canceled. It is the old, old story of the debtors against the creditor.

I hope the 20,000 legionnaires who go over to Europe will know the whole truth and will appreciate that we canceled 53 per cent of the French war debt and that the amount we are asking from France to-day only equals that which we lent her after the armistice.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. Yes; I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. Is there not reason to believe there is a well-organized movement in this country to bring about a cancellation of the foreign debts?

Mr. FISH. I do not believe it is very well organized, except among some of the international bankers. Of course, they have the money to spend on propaganda. However, I do not believe it is going to get very far in this country. What I am afraid of is that it will create bad feeling because of the evident misunderstanding in foreign countries.

Let us now see whether our terms to France are harsh. Let us overlook what France gained in Alsace and Lorraine as well as what she gained by her mandates in Syria and in Africa. France receives 52 per cent of the German reparations, and in 1944 France will receive \$300,000,000 a year from Germany. According to the English debt settlement with France and the pending American debt settlement with France, France will be called upon in 1944 to pay about \$186,000,000, leaving a balance to France of about \$114,000,000 annually; a surplus of \$114,000,000 coming in from the German reparations beyond the amount which she will have to pay out to Great Britain and the United States. Is that a very harsh settlement?

We are not dealing with a bankrupt nation. We are dealing with France, whose bonds have gone up, and that is an index not only of present prosperity but of future prosperity. We are dealing with nations able to pay; and I think we should uphold not only the hands of the President but of the Debt Funding Commission, who settled these debts on long-term payments covering 62 years at a low rate of interest and on a fair and just basis, and above all on a basis of utmost generosity.

This is the information we should take back to our people—not that we have been Shylocks but that we have been generous to the nth degree. When the French debt resolution passed the House of Representatives there were 112 negative votes, and these men voted against it not because they thought the Con-

gress was not generous but because they thought the Congress was overgenerous. That was the only opposition existing in this House; and I hope the Members will take home to their districts the one fact that the House of Representatives, in approving the Berenger-Mellon French debt settlement, acted with unparalleled generosity. [Applause.]

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, November 8, 1923

LOANS AND SUBSIDIES GRANTED BY FRANCE TO THE UNITED STATES DURING AND IMMEDIATELY FOLLOWING THE REVOLUTIONARY WAR

France made four loans to the United States during and immediately following the Revolution, all of which were negotiated by the Continental Congress. The details of these loans are as follows:

Date	Loan	When due	Amount	Interest rate
1777	1,000,000 livres from Farmers General of France under authority of resolution Dec. 23, 1776. (Secret Journals of Congress, "Foreign Affairs," Vol. II, p. 36.)	Indefinite. (Contract dated Mar. 24, 1777, House Miscellaneous Documents, No. 603, pt. 2, 60th Cong., 1st sess., serial No. 2585, p. 300, Revolutionary Diplomatic Correspondence of the United States, Wharton.)	\$181,500	Per cent 5
1778-1782	18,000,000 livres from French Government under authority of resolution Dec. 3, 1777. (Journals of Congress, Vol. II, p. 359.)	12 annual installments from the third year after conclusion of peace. (Contract dated July 16, 1782, Journals of Congress, Vol. IV, appendix, p. 20, Way and Gideon Washington, 1823.)	3,267,000	5
1781-1782	10,000,000 livres from French Government under authority of resolution. Oct. 26, 1779. (Secret Journals of Congress, Vol. II, p. 283.)	10 annual installments from Nov. 5, 1787. (Contract drawn July 16, 1782, Journals of Congress, Vol. IV, appendix, p. 20.)	1,815,000	4
1783	6,000,000 livres from French Government under authority resolution. Sept. 14, 1782. (Journals of Congress, Vol. IV, p. 78.)	6 annual installments from Jan. 1, 1785. (Contracts drawn Feb. 25, 1783, Journals of Congress, Vol. IV, appendix, p. 23.)	1,089,000	15

¹ Beginning Jan. 1, 1784.

The 18,000,000,000-livre loan was made in installments ranging over the period of 1778-1782, the advances in the latter year amounting to 6,000,000 livres. In the contract of July 16, 1782, France remitted the arrears of interest on this loan to that date " * * * and from thence to the date of the treaty of peace * * *." In this same contract France also agreed to bear the commissions and bank charges incident to the 10,000,000-livre loan, which was in fact borrowed from Holland by France for the account of the United States. Franklin in transmitting this contract said, in part: "In reading the contract you will discover several fresh marks of the King's goodness to us, amounting to the value of near two millions (livres)."

Due to the condition of the finances of the new Government, interest payments on these loans, as well as the instalments on the principal, were not always made promptly, but the account, both principal and interest, with the exception of the interest remitted as shown above, was ultimately settled in full. All amounts still unpaid in 1795 were converted into domestic stock bearing interest at 4½ and 5½ per cent per annum. Oliver Wolcott, jr., the Secretary of the Treasury at that time, said that " * * * by this operation the debt as due under former contracts to the Republic of France may be considered as discharged." The details pertaining to repayments on the principal and refunding operations of the various loans are as follows:

Repayments on the principal and refunding operations of the various loans

Date	Loan	Repayments	Merged into 5½ per cent stock	Merged into 4½ per cent stock	Total
1778-1779	First loan	\$27,811.11	(?)		\$27,811.11
1791	Second loan	544,500.00			544,500.00
1792	Second loan	1,089,000.00			1,089,000.00
	Third loan	726,000.00			726,000.00
1793	First loan	153,888.89			153,888.89
	Second loan	272,250.00			272,250.00
	Third loan	544,500.00			544,500.00
1794	Second loan	329,100.00			329,100.00
	Third loan	186,983.96			186,983.96
1795	Second loan	272,250.00	\$759,900.00		1,032,150.00
	Third loan	181,516.04		\$176,000.00	377,516.04
	Fourth loan		1,089,000.00		1,089,000.00
	Total	4,327,600.00	1,848,900.00	176,000.00	6,352,500.00

¹ In tobacco.

² American State Papers, Finance, vol. 1, p. 360.

There is attached a photostat copy of a statement prepared by the Register of the United States Treasury, dated April 28, 1800 (American State Papers, Finance, vol. 1, p. 671), which shows the French debt at the beginning of the Government and its ultimate extinguishment, both principal and interest. Thus, of the total amount of \$6,352,500 borrowed, the sum of \$4,327,600 was repaid by 1795, and the balance, or \$2,024,900, was refunded into 4½ per cent and 5½ per cent domestic stock. The 4½ per cent stock was all repaid in due course between 1807-8, while the final payment was made on the 5½ per cent stock in 1815.

In addition to the loans described above, there were certain aids and subsidies granted by the French King to the American Colonies. In these subsidies Spain participated to the extent of 1,000,000 livres. The amounts and dates of these subsidies are as follows:

	Livres
In 1776, from France	2,000,000
In 1776, from Spain	1,000,000
In 1777, from France	2,000,000
In 1781, from France	6,000,000
Total (livres equal to \$1,996,500)	11,000,000

Thus, the gifts from France amounted to \$1,815,000.

The first subsidy from France of 2,000,000 livres and the subsidy of 1,000,000 from Spain were handled by M. Caron de Beaumarchais, who carried on his work under the guise of a Spanish trading company by the name of Roderique Hortales & Co. The others were negotiated through Benjamin Franklin. So far as the Treasury has been able to determine the facts, there was never any misunderstanding over the gratuities granted by the French King to the United States through Benjamin Franklin, in amount 8,000,000 livres. The adjustment of 1795 seems conclusive in this respect. Moreover, the mutual claims of France and the United States have been the subject of several treaties between the parties, but no reference is found to any supposed debt to France originating in the support given by France to the

United States in the Revolutionary War. The earliest of these treaties was the one of September 30, 1800, followed by that of April 30, 1803, ceding Louisiana to the United States.

A dispute, however, arose between Beaumarchais and Congress over the claims of the former. He made large shipments of munitions and supplies to this country for the use of the Revolutionary Army, aggregating over 6,000,000 livres, according to Bayley's History of National Loans of the United States. These were afterwards the subject of claims presented by Beaumarchais and his heirs. Settlement was finally made in 1835 by the payment of 810,000 livres to his heirs. Mr. Bayley made a careful investigation of the claims of Beaumarchais against the United States, and in stating the amount in the volume referred to shows an overpayment by the United States of 1,426,787 livres (about \$250,000).

No. 6
Statement of the French debt at the commencement of the present Government, and of its ultimate extinguishment
[Treasury Department, Register's Office, April 28, 1800]

	Livres	s.	d.	
To general account of foreign receipts and expenditures remitted to Paris, from Amsterdam and Antwerp: Guilders 10,080,419 1 produced	24,193,005	14	04	\$4,032,167.62
To account of expenditures of the United States: Paid at the treasury, \$2,751,904	15,162,005	09	10	2,751,904.00
To the War Department: For supplies of military stores, \$8,962	49,377	08	02	8,962.00
To loan of foreign debt: Amount of 5½ per cent stock, \$1,848,900; amount of 4½ per cent stock, \$176,000	11,156,473	16	07	2,024,900.00
To profit and loss account: For a gain arising from the exchange between Amsterdam and Antwerp, and Paris, viz, the remittances from Amsterdam and Antwerp, on account of the principal of the French debt, were livres 24,193,005.14 4 18.15				\$4,391,030.53
The value of guilders, 10,080,419 1 40				4,032,167.62

Statement of the French debt at the commencement of the present Government, and of its ultimate extinguishment—Continued

Difference to the credit of this account from ex- change.....	Livres	s.	d.	
Total.....	50,560,862	08	11	9,176,796.53
CAPITAL ON JAN. 1, 1920				
Loan of 18,000,000 livres.....	18,000,000	00	00	
Loan of 10,000,000 livres.....	10,000,000	00	00	
Loan of 6,000,000 livres.....	6,000,000	00	00	
				34,000,000 00 00
Balance of account of supplies set- tled at the Treasury.....		134,065	07 06	
Contract with the Farmers Gen- eral.....	1,000,000	00	00	
Deduct so much paid by the late Government.....	153,229	57		
				846,770 14 5
Deduct supplies furnished the French consul, by the late Gov- ernment.....	448,471	14	8	
				398,298 19 09
Principal (livres).....	34,532,364	07	03	6,267,624.15
INTEREST ON JAN. 1, 1920				
Arrearages of interest on the capital.....	8,800,000	00	00	
Arrearages of interest on supplies.....	41,895	87		
Contract with Farmers General.....	126,017	15	4	
				8,967,913 3 11
Interest which ac- crued in 1920, on supplies and Farmers Gen- eral contract.....	1,600,000	00	00	
	26,618	14	4	
				1,626,618 14 4
Interest (livres).....	10,594,531	18	03	
				45,126,896 05 06
Interest in 1921, 1922, 1923, 1924, and 1925, until paid off.....	5,433,966	03	05	986,264.85
				50,560,862 08 11
				9,176,796.53

JOSEPH NOURSE, Register.

SHOULD THE DEBTS OF THE ALLIES TO THE UNITED STATES BE CANCELED
Address by Hon. THEODORE E. BURTON, of Ohio, at Buffalo, Foreign
Policy Association luncheon, Statler Hotel, November 27, 1926

Notwithstanding criticisms of the attitude of the United States and occasional careless accusations that this country is playing the part of a Shylock, I support the negative of this proposition. Much attention has been given to features in debt settlements which are favorable to the United States, and these have been eagerly received in Europe. It is now time to show that the settlements have been generous to Europe. In the discussion it will be necessary to understand certain fundamental facts.

It was a glad day for the Allies when, in April, 1917, the United States declared war against the German Government. With wildest enthusiasm the word was passed along down in the trenches, along the battle front, and everywhere, "America is our ally." For the days were dark for them. They had suffered many defeats.

First of all our assistance was most effective in rendering financial aid, for all of them were nearly at the end of their resources. For this purpose, beginning in the month of April, 1917, acts were passed at Washington for extending loans, and by successive acts the amount was fixed at \$10,000,000,000; also for sale of surplus supplies and for relief. Nine billion six hundred million dollars was turned over to them in cash, some \$600,000,000 in supplies, and \$140,000,000 in food for the suffering populations of Europe—an aggregate of \$10,340,000,000.

Under these successive statutes loans were made to 20 countries. Two are out of the picture—Armenia which, if it ever had a government, does not have one now, to which country \$12,000,000 was advanced, and to Russia \$192,000,000, which debt has been repudiated by the Soviet Government. In addition, \$24,000,000 was advanced to Austria, on which a moratorium until 1943 has been granted. There were several minor loans—\$10,000,000 to Cuba, which has been repaid, \$166,000 to Nicaragua, which is in process of repayment, and the trivial sum of \$26,000 to Liberia.

A distinction must be made between these loans which assumes vital importance. Part of the advances was before the armistice of November 11, 1918, for amounts expended presumably for munitions, for food, and necessary supplies for the prosecution of the war. The balance was advanced after the armistice.

Advances before the armistice, save a small amount to Czechoslovakia, were made to six nations only—England, France, Belgium, Italy, Serbia (now the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes), and to Russia. For the remaining nations the loans or advances were made after the armistice, and the question of borrowing while suffering from the hardships of war can not be raised. The nations borrowing before November 11, 1918, the date of the armistice, also received very large amounts after that date.

In February, 1922, three years and more after the virtual close of the war, a debt commission of five members was created, with Secretary Mellon as chairman, upon which was imposed the duty of making settlements with these debtor countries. In the following year, with a view of making the commission nonpartisan, three other members were added, making eight in all. The commission laid down three essential principles in the settlement of the debts:

First. That the principal sum must be paid.

Second. That the greatest possible leniency must be extended in rates of interest and in time for payment. Time for payment in all the settlements has been fixed at 62 years.

Third. That in fixing these settlements there must be careful regard for the capacity of the different nations to pay.

The statute required first a settlement by the commission, then an approval by the President, then an approval by the Congress.

Now, why are we insisting on the payment of these debts to the United States? In giving the reasons I am substantially repeating a statement which I made to a European audience at London in September, 1922. This statement was then recognized as just and fair. First, the sanctity of international obligations. The whole structure of credit would break down if a policy of cancellation should be established. There is not only a sanctity but a certain sacredness in international obligations, particularly when the transaction is between two governments, and there is a creditor nation as well as a debtor nation. The disastrous effects of cancellation would not rest merely upon the creditor, for if in the future an emergency should arise, by reason of war or other similar events, the debtor countries would find it practically impossible to borrow again. Second, the loans made to these countries—\$10,000,000,000 and more—were not paid out of an overflowing Treasury. The authorization for them was in the Liberty loan acts. The money was borrowed from the American people, and you all know how intensive a campaign there was to compel all classes to join in those loans. In many cities there was a committee established to fix the quota which each person should subscribe. Those who advocate cancellation can not be consistent unless they promptly surrender to the United States Treasury the bonds which they hold, the proceeds of which were lent to European countries. The Government of the United States, the Treasury, is but a trustee for the American people for the payment of these debts.

Now, the third reason—and not much attention has been called to it—is this: While burdens of foreign countries are very severe, proportionately—remember that word "proportionately"—our burden of debt and taxation has increased as much if not more than with any of them. Before the war our national debt, deducting credits, amounted to barely a billion dollars. When it reached its peak in August, 1919, it was \$25,500,000,000, and by reason of our participation in the conflict approximately \$35,000,000,000 raised by current taxation and by loans was paid by the American people. A Treasury statement issued in 1920 estimates the cost of the war up to that year at \$53,455,000,000. The burden of national taxation was very light before 1917, but it increased so that in some forms of income tax it was 70 per cent and more; also there was an excess-profits tax, and we are now paying some \$800,000,000 per year interest on the debt incurred. Again, in the last year \$405,000,000 was expended for the Veterans' Bureau. So we by no means have been left unscathed. We have borne our burden—and again I use the word "proportionately." That burden has been equal to, if not greater, than that of any other country.

Then there is a fourth reason, and I found this appealed to a certain element in Great Britain more than anything else. If we should relieve the debtor nations of their obligations or cancel a substantial part, in view of the antagonisms which prevail in Europe, with the ambition to surpass each other in military and naval armament, the amount released would inevitably be expended for increasing their military and naval armament, and thus create a constant threat to the peace of the world.

Next, the United States as the result of the war gained no accessions of territory. We have claimed no large reparations. Some of our Allies who were engaged in the conflict multiplied their possessions as a result of the war, acquiring very valuable areas in the outlying portions of the earth. Perhaps there has been no very great benefit from these thus far, but if they are retained they are sure to be a very great source of increasing wealth, and in some instances of military strength, to the countries which have acquired them.

Then, deny it as anyone may, we were not in the same degree of imminent danger that the countries of Europe were. France, Great Britain, Italy, Belgium, and Serbia realized that the very life of their countries was at stake. The invading armies were within 15 miles of Paris.

I maintain here, and I have maintained in Europe, that our entrance into the war was largely based on motives of altruism. We were not in serious danger. We might have stood aloof, we might have profited by the misfortunes of other countries; but to maintain the cause of popular government, to repress absolutism, for the sake of a better and more ordered world, we entered into that fight and we turned the scale in favor of the Allies and those whose ideals we favor.

Some say that the great prosperity we have enjoyed has been due to the war and to our sales to the Allies. It is true that we did sell things at high prices, but I must deny that allegation, which is very common in Europe. We are enjoying wonderful prosperity to-day, but it is not because of the war, because that war cost us, as I have said, nearly \$35,000,000,000. What is the reason? It is because of the marvelous scientific development in this country, mass production, the efficiency of our workers, the better utilization of natural resources, the utilization of machinery, better business organization. All these factors were powerfully at work years before the war. We lead the world not merely in wealth but we lead in all these particulars. Perhaps if I were to put any one thing at the head it would be our adoption of mass production. Because of these facts we are now occupying the proud position that we occupy, and not by any means by reason of any gains made because of the war.

Have the terms of settlement with foreign debtors been severe? An analysis of the figures utterly disproves this accusation.

The Debt Commission has negotiated settlements with 13 countries. Eleven of these have been given full force and effect. With Greece no agreement has been reached. The agreement with Yugoslavia awaits approval by the Senate, and that with France approval by the Senate and by the French Government. In all of these a period of 62 years is given for payment. The rate of interest in liquidating the amount due was fixed at 4¼ per cent to December 15, 1922, and thereafter at 3 per cent until the date of final agreement. The settlement with Great Britain, which is for \$4,600,000,000, was made with the provision that 3 per cent interest should be paid for the first 10 years and 3¼ per cent for the remaining 52 years. Payments of principal begin with \$23,000,000 in the first year and reach \$175,000,000 in the sixty-second year. The greatest credit is due to this country for its recognition of its obligations and its compliance thus far with the terms of settlement.

If payments be computed or discounted at 4¼ per cent interest, the general rate now paid by the United States upon its Liberty bonds, it appears that a very considerable share of the fixed indebtedness has been released, ranging from approximately 20 per cent in the case of Great Britain to 75 per cent in the settlement with Italy, and this includes indebtedness incurred after the virtual close of the war as well as during the contest. In the settlement with Belgium no interest whatever is charged for the 62 years on the prearmistice debt, and the average rate of interest during the 62-year period is 1.8 per cent. France begins with payments of \$30,000,000, reaching \$35,000,000 in the fifth year. For this five-year period no interest is charged. The average rate of interest during the 62-year period for France is 1.6 per cent, for Yugoslavia 1 per cent, and for Italy four-tenths of 1 per cent. On the same basis of computation as that already mentioned—4¼ per cent—more than half, or 53 per cent, of the debt of France has been canceled and 75 per cent of that of Italy.

The most lenient settlement was made with Italy, because the commission felt, on full consideration, that the lack of natural resources in that country and a prospectively permanent balance of trade against her due to the necessary purchase of food and other essential supplies, made her capacity to pay less promising than that of the others.

But it is said that the burdens imposed upon the debtor countries are beyond their capacity to pay, and that this alleged inability has been much accentuated by our tariff act of 1922. A former candidate for an important office in this country made the statement in France recently that the payment of these debts would subject Europe to slavery for a generation. The statement is absurd.

The payments which European nations must make to us for the first five years average \$210,000,000. By the sixth year they will have reached \$230,000,000, in the tenth year about \$275,000,000, and by the twentieth year nearly \$360,000,000.

The increase in imports into the United States from European countries and their dependencies between the fiscal years of 1922, when the commission was organized, and 1926 was from \$1,422,000,000 in 1922 to \$2,730,000,000 in 1926, an increase of \$1,308,000,000, or 92 per cent. During this time our exports to these countries increased by only 22 per cent. The figures relating to exports and imports of the United States would seem to point to a time when the balance of trade will be against us. This is due to receipts of payments from abroad and to the rapid increase in consumption by our people. A tariff barrier can not be erected so high as to prevent an increase of imports.

There is another class of expenses which proves the ability of Europe to pay. American tourists, according to the best estimates, expended in Europe in the year 1925, \$370,000,000, of which, according to estimates by the best French authority, \$225,000,000 was expended in France. In addition to this there are very large remittances by immigrants in the United States, insurance premiums, ocean freights, and payments by passengers on European ships. Of course, this does not take into account subscriptions by benevolent organizations or the very large amount of loans made for European enterprises, the result of which must be to increase their debt-paying capacity.

Looking in another direction, it is fit we should consider what the debtor countries are paying for military expenses; for if there is any one thing that is needed for greater prosperity and happiness the world over, it is a decrease of military expenses. The most recent budget of

military expenses for Great Britain provides for the army £45,000,000, for the air service £15,000,000, for the navy £60,000,000; in all, approximately £120,000,000, or about \$582,000,000. Their total payments to us are about \$161,000,000 per annum, or much less than one-third. Indeed, the increase in military expenses in Great Britain over pre-war is \$200,000,000, much more than their total annual payments to us.

The estimate in France for military and naval expenditures for 1925 was 5,169,000,000 francs, which, with the shifting value of their currency, can not be readily stated in dollars with accuracy, but at least it would be \$150,000,000, or five times the payment of France to the United States on her debt.

In Czechoslovakia, a country of about 12,000,000 people, they are maintaining a standing army of 150,000. The appropriation for national defense for 1926 is 1,695,000,000 crowns, or, in gold value, about \$50,000,000 a year. All that she is paying to us for 18 years is \$3,000,000 per annum.

The appropriations for the Ministry of War in Poland for the pending year amount to 554,000,000 zlotys. The present gold value of a zloty is about 11¼ cents, making their expenses somewhat over \$60,000,000. The first payment of Poland to the United States agreed upon is \$5,916,800, with an option to pay only \$1,000,000 the first year, increasing by \$500,000 per year for each of the succeeding four years. The present value of their debt, on a basis of 4¼ per cent, is \$146,825,000. Thus it will appear that the military expenses of less than two and one-half years would pay off this debt.

Rumania expends over 5,000,000,000 lei per year, or about \$27,000,000 for military expenses. The present value of their debt on the same basis as that stated for Poland is \$35,172,000. Thus their military expenses for one year and a third would pay off the whole of their debt to the United States.

The same class of comparisons might be made for the whole list of debtor nations. The proportion of total expenses in the various countries shows that no overwhelming burden is imposed upon any of them. The percentages range from a maximum of approximately 4.1 per cent of her expenditures in the case of Great Britain to six-tenths of 1 per cent in the case of Italy. The payments of Czechoslovakia would be almost exactly 1 per cent.

Reference should also be made to the distinction already mentioned between prearmistice and postarmistice advances to the respective countries. It can by no means be claimed that cancellation of postarmistice indebtedness should be made because the most substantial share of the amounts was for relief and rehabilitation, and in some instances there were expenditures for new enterprises. Of the 13 nations with which settlements have been made, six incurred no indebtedness to us prior to the armistice of November 11, 1918. Nevertheless, the greatest degree of leniency has been shown to each of these. The best illustration of a country in which there was a division of expenses between prearmistice and postarmistice is that of France. When the amounts were liquidated in the recent settlement made by the commission, it was found that of the principal sums advanced \$1,970,000,000 was prearmistice and \$1,370,000,000 postarmistice. If the rate of interest on the latter amount, \$1,370,000,000, should be fixed at 5 per cent it would appear that, as a result, payments would be almost exactly equal to the total sum which France must pay under the terms of the settlement. In other words, figuring on this percentage, which is substantially less than what France is now paying, the United States would forgive all advances made before the armistice and require payment only of the amounts advanced or accrued thereafter.

The above facts and figures prove that the United States has not been severe upon our debtors; rather she has been not merely fair, but generous.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE OHIO RIVER AT PADUCAH

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 16888) granting the consent of Congress to the Paducah Board of Trade (Inc.), of Paducah, Ky., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Ohio River.

The SPEAKER. Can the gentleman assure the Chair that this is a matter of emergency?

Mr. BARKLEY. This is a matter of emergency, Mr. Speaker, and time is of the essence; otherwise I would not ask for recognition.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the Paducah Board of Trade (Inc.), of Paducah, Ky., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Ohio River at a point suitable to the interests of navigation between the city of Paducah, Ky., and the city of Brookport, Ill., in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906, and subject to the conditions and limitations contained in this act.

SEC. 2. There is hereby conferred upon the Paducah Board of Trade (Inc.), its successors and assigns, all such rights and powers to enter upon lands and to acquire, condemn, occupy, possess, and use real estate and other property needed for the location, construction, operation, and maintenance of such bridge and its approaches and terminals, as are possessed by railroad corporations for railroad purposes or by bridge corporations for bridge purposes in the State in which such real estate or other property is situated, upon making just compensation therefor, to be ascertained and paid according to the laws of such State, and the proceedings therefor shall be the same as in the condemnation and expropriation of property in such State.

SEC. 3. The said Paducah Board of Trade (Inc.), its successors and assigns, is hereby authorized to fix and charge tolls for transit over such bridge, and the rates of toll so fixed shall be the legal rates until changed by the Secretary of War under the authority contained in the act of March 23, 1906.

SEC. 4. After the completion of such bridge, as determined by the Secretary of War, either the State of Kentucky, the State of Illinois, any political subdivision of either of such States, within or adjoining which any part of such bridge is located, or any two or more of them jointly, may at any time acquire and take over all right, title, and interest in such bridge and its approaches, and any interest in real property necessary therefor, by purchase or by condemnation in accordance with the laws of either of such States governing the acquisition of private property for public purposes by condemnation. If at any time after the expiration of 20 years after the completion of such bridge the same is acquired by condemnation, the amount of damages or compensation to be allowed shall not include good will, going value, or prospective revenues or profits, but shall be limited to the sum of (1) the actual cost of constructing bridge and its approaches, less a reasonable deduction for actual depreciation in value, (2) the actual cost of acquiring such interests in real property, (3) actual financing and promotion cost, not to exceed 10 per cent of the sum of the cost of constructing the bridge and its approaches and acquiring such interest in real property, and (4) actual expenditures for necessary improvements.

SEC. 5. If such bridge shall be taken over or acquired by the States or political subdivisions thereof as provided in section 4 of this act, and if tolls are charged for the use thereof, the rates of toll shall be so adjusted as to provide a fund sufficient to pay for the cost of maintaining, repairing, and operating the bridge and its approaches, to pay an adequate return on the cost thereof, and to provide a sinking fund sufficient to amortize the amount paid therefor as soon as possible under reasonable charges, but within a period of not to exceed 20 years from the date of acquiring the same. After a sinking fund sufficient to pay the cost of acquiring the bridge and its approaches shall have been provided, such bridge shall thereafter be maintained and operated free of tolls, or the rate of tolls shall thereafter be so adjusted as to provide a fund of not to exceed the amount necessary for the proper care, repair, maintenance, and operation of the bridge and its approaches. An accurate record of the amount paid for acquiring the bridge and its approaches, the expenditures of operating, repairing, and maintaining the same, and of the daily tolls collected shall be kept, and shall be available for the information of all persons interested.

SEC. 6. The Paducah Board of Trade (Inc.), its successors and assigns, shall within 90 days after the completion of such bridge file with the Secretary of War a sworn itemized statement showing the actual original cost of constructing such bridge and its approaches, the actual cost of acquiring any interest in real property necessary therefor, and the actual financing and promotion costs. The Secretary of War may, at any time within three years after the completion of such bridge, investigate the actual cost of constructing the same and for such purpose the said Paducah Board of Trade (Inc.), its successors and assigns, shall make available all of its records in connection with the financing and the construction thereof. The findings of the Secretary of War as to the actual original cost of the bridge shall be conclusive, subject only to review in a court of equity for fraud or gross mistake.

SEC. 7. The right to sell, assign, transfer, and mortgage all the rights, powers, and privileges conferred by this act is hereby granted to the Paducah Board of Trade (Inc.), its successors and assigns, and corporation to which or any person to whom such rights, powers, and privileges may be sold, assigned, or transferred, or who shall acquire the same by mortgage foreclosure or otherwise, is hereby authorized and empowered to exercise the same as fully as though conferred herein directly upon such corporation or person.

SEC. 8. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 3, line 12, after the word "constructing," insert the word "such."

Page 4, line 13, after the word "expenditures," strike out the word "of" and insert in lieu thereof the word "for."

Page 5, line 11, after the word "and," insert the word "any."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

On motion of Mr. BARKLEY, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

THE M'NARY-HAUGEN BILL

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, I desire to present a privileged resolution from the Committee on Rules.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio offers a resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 405

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 15474) entitled "A bill to establish a Federal farm board to aid in the orderly marketing and in the control and disposition of the surplus of agricultural commodities."

After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 12 hours, to be equally divided, and controlled by the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and the gentleman from Louisiana, Mr. ASWELL, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment the committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the time for debate on this resolution be fixed at 1 hour and 40 minutes, to be controlled by myself, but I express the intention to yield of that 1 hour and 40 minutes one-half to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POU].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent that the time of debate on this resolution be extended 40 minutes, so that such debate may continue for 1 hour and 40 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, when the unanimous-consent agreement was reached as to the amount of time to be devoted to general debate on this question, it may be recalled that I asked what would be the plight of any Members who found insuperable objections to all three bills, and was told that with 12 hours at disposition, there would be no difficulty in such gentlemen finding opportunity to express their views.

I have not consulted all of the numerous gentlemen who are concerned in arranging the allotment of this time, but I have consulted several and find a very natural and pardonable reluctance on their part to give opportunity to their colleagues to punch holes in their positions. This was to have been expected, and had I been one of those gentlemen I should have taken the same view. There are other gentlemen besides myself who desire some very small opportunity to present to the House reasons in opposition to all three bills. In view of that I ask the gentleman who has requested this unanimous consent, if he should deem it practicable to extend the hour and 40 minutes which he has requested to 2 hours and 40 minutes. Of course, the debate upon the rule will be almost altogether addressed to the subject matter involved, so that there would be no inconsistency in giving those of us who desire to oppose all three bills a slight opportunity to express our judgment. If he should not think that the wise way to proceed, then I ask whether he would object to an amendment to the rule specifying that those who are opposed to all the proposals shall have one-twelfth of the available time, or one-thirteenth of it, if an additional hour be given for general debate upon the subject.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, it has been the understanding of the Committee on Rules that a limited amount of time would be granted to those opposed to any and all bills. If that understanding is not to be carried out, if there are difficulties in the way, I should feel reluctant to a change of the rule extending the time, say, from 12 hours to 13 hours. Such a proposition could naturally be presented to the House only after the previous question on this resolution is voted down. Personally, I have no objection to an extension of the time from 1 hour and 40 minutes asked for for debate on the rule. That, however, rests with the House. I ask the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LUCE] what would be the least time with which he would feel satisfied in presenting his views on this subject, bearing in mind that in the discussion of the rule it is not the usual custom to discuss at very great length the merits of the bill.

Mr. LUCE. Personally, I should desire not more than 15 or 20 minutes at the outside, but I was told yesterday of five or six other gentlemen who take the same position and desire

to object to all of the bills. I should think that an hour divided among them might be a reasonable suggestion; but if that is too long, I shall not speak for the others, but will let them speak for themselves, and request for myself an opportunity to address the House for 20 minutes on this matter.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, I should like to know of others who desire to be heard in opposition to all of the bills.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have 10 minutes.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I should like to know when the opposition to all these bills that are pending will have an opportunity to be heard. It is my understanding that the time is divided between the proponents of two of the leading bills. I do not see how those of us who are opposed to both of them can consistently expect any time from them.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Ohio yield?

Mr. BURTON. Yes.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LUCE] and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HUDDLESTON] are both laboring under a misapprehension. There is only one agricultural bill that has been reported out, and that is the bill commonly known as the Haugen bill. It is true that in the air there are rumors that certain Members of the House are for other agricultural plans, but there is no other plan on the calendar of the House. Here is the Haugen bill. Those who are in favor of the Haugen bill are naturally entitled to one half of the time and those who are opposed to it, whether for another plan or no plan, are entitled to the other half of the time. There is but one proposition, the Haugen bill, that the rule proposes, and that is the only thing that can come before the House under the rule. It is the only agricultural bill that is on the calendar of the House reported out at this session.

Mr. EDWARDS. Oh, I think the gentleman must be mistaken. Did not the rule mention the Aswell bill?

Mr. RAMSEYER. No; the gentleman is mistaken. The rule mentions the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ASWELL] as being entitled to control one half of the time, and it mentions the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN], as chairman of the committee, who shall control the other half of the time.

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

Mr. RAMSEYER. If I have the floor.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. We are not dealing with a theory, but we are dealing with a practical situation in which those who are opposed to the principle on which the bills are grounded are entitled to be heard, and not be forced to allow the country to think that it is a mere choice between those various measures.

Mr. RAMSEYER. That is not a situation that is peculiar to this bill; that is a situation that may exist as to numerous other bills. The Rules Committee, with but few exceptions, has never reported out rules except to recognize those who are for and those who are against the bill reported. Probably before the Congress adjourns there will be a rule here to consider the disposition of Muscle Shoals. There are at least a half dozen proposals for the disposition of power down there.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. But it is rare for a rule to lodge the right to all of the debate in certain named individuals. I do not know, but in this particular case I have an idea that both gentlemen controlling the time for debate will eventually vote for whichever of the bills is accepted.

Mr. RAMSEYER. I do not know about that.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Ohio yield?

Mr. BURTON. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I suggest to the gentleman from Ohio that in the interest of expedition it might be well to accept the proposal suggested by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LUCE]. As I understand it, the gentleman wants 20 minutes. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HUDDLESTON] will want possibly as much time. I think an additional hour might very well be granted under those conditions.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, I was about to make a change in my request for unanimous consent.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Why not instead of an additional 40 minutes add 2 hours to the general debate and take the usual hour on the rule?

Mr. BURTON. If anyone desires to make a request for unanimous consent to that effect, he may do so. I was about to suggest, Mr. Speaker, a modification of my original request, and that the time given for discussion on the rule be made 2 hours and 10 minutes, of which 20 minutes shall be awarded to the

gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LUCE] and about as much time to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HUDDLESTON].

There are two points involved: First, notwithstanding what my good friend from Iowa stated, it must be recognized that the gentleman who is to control the time in opposition to the bill is the proponent of another measure that is agricultural legislation along a different line. I am informed by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. UNDERHILL] that he desires time not on the rule but in the discussion of the bill. I can only conjecture, but I think the Committee of the Whole will be generous to those who desire to be heard in the discussion when the bill is read by paragraphs under the five-minute rule.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Reserving the right to object, unanimous consent has not been put yet.

Mr. DEAL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire if it is contended that those who object to all bills would have an opportunity to address the House? Now, I have been told by certain gentlemen interested in this legislation that those who are opposed to all bills will not be recognized at all and will not be permitted to have an opportunity to address the House.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, I have already answered that question. It was the understanding of the Committee on Rules that opportunity would be given to those who oppose all bills, but it is stated by at least one Member here that he has had difficulty in obtaining an assignment of any time.

Mr. POU. If the gentleman from Ohio will permit, I would suggest to the gentleman that if the time is increased to 2 hours and 40 minutes, and if the gentleman from Ohio will yield to me one-half of that time to be yielded to others, if I see fit to do so, that all sides can be taken care of. This matter is of paramount importance, and I believe it would be in the interest of our expediting the consideration of this great problem that the House is considering if the time is increased to 2 hours and 40 minutes, and I will take care of the opposition on this side.

Mr. BURTON. Those opposed to all the bills—

Mr. DEAL. Does that mean those who oppose all bills can only present their views during the 2 hours and 40 minutes?

Mr. BURTON. I am unable to answer that question. It is a question that must be settled by those who have control of the time in the Committee of the Whole, so I can only repeat the statement made a few moments ago, that I conjecture that the disposition of the House in Committee of the Whole will be to deal generously with those who desire time on any and all phases of this question.

Mr. DEAL. If those who are opposed will not be allowed any time, I would like to have that matter made known.

Mr. TILSON. Would it not be a very proper time and place here in the discussion of the rule for those who are opposed to all legislation along this line to oppose the rule, and in giving their reasons for opposing the rule to discuss the merits of the bill or of any other bill that may be proposed to be substituted for it? It would be perfectly proper argument on the part of those opposing all legislation to urge against the passage of a rule making it in order. Could not the gentleman arrange to give these gentlemen time?

Mr. DEAL. If the gentleman will yield. That means only a few minutes for all of those who are opposed to all bills in question, and yet when the question for general debate comes up there will be 12 hours allowed to those who are favoring these bills. It does not seem to me that is quite a fair disposition of time. I am sure that there will be a great many who are opposed to all bills, and they should have opportunity to speak. Therefore those who are opposed to all bills may be limited to 5 or 10 minutes in which to express their views, while those favoring the bill will have opportunity perhaps for half an hour or more in which to argue their side. That does not seem to me to be a fair way to arrange the time.

Mr. BURTON. I again present my request, to the effect that the time for general debate on this resolution be 2 hours and 40 minutes, to be controlled by myself, with the intention and the promise to yield one-half of that time to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POU]. I will state that I shall try as far as possible to give time—and I expect in that to have the cooperation of the gentleman from North Carolina—to those who are opposed to all the bills presented.

Mr. POU. I will see to it that they are fairly treated, as far as my time permits.

Mr. BURTON. I shall expect the gentleman from North Carolina to give more time to the opponents than I myself can yield.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent that the debate on the rule be for 2 hours and 40 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, this rule does not provide any time for those who are opposed to all of these bills. I am opposed to all the bills, and therefore I object.

Mr. BURTON. Then, Mr. Speaker, we must proceed under the rule, under which I have one hour.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for one hour.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, whatever may be the opinion of the individual members of the Committee on Rules as to the merits of the McNary-Haugen bill, we recognize that the so-called agricultural problem is one of supreme importance and deserves the most careful attention of the House at this time. We recognize also that the Committee on Agriculture, which has for a long time had measures pertaining to agricultural relief under consideration, has reported, at least by a majority, this bill. So we are unanimous in bringing in this rule.

I may say that I am personally opposed to the measure, but it is my desire in the time afforded to me to give opportunity to the advocates of the bill to present their case. I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. PURNELL].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. PURNELL. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, six and one-half million farmers, who produce the food of this Nation, are again knocking at the doors of the American Congress asking for relief. I am convinced in my own mind, after nearly six years' study in and out of the Committee on Agriculture, of which I have the honor to be a member, that not less than four and one-half millions of these farmers desire the enactment of the bill which is presented before you by the Committee on Agriculture [applause], and known throughout the country in almost every household as the McNary-Haugen bill.

Who are these people who are knocking at the doors of the American Congress, who come here with more humility and patience, I may say, than any class has ever shown? Who are these six and a half million farmers who are asking for relief? They are the people who own and control the largest business we know anything about in this country, the business of farming. Six and one-half millions of them live on the farm. They provide the food of this Nation. Thirty millions of men, women, and children live on the farms, and their business in dollars and cents is worth more than the combined valuation of all the coal mines, plus the manufacturing plants, plus the railroads, plus the capital, surplus, and undivided profits of all the banks and trust companies in the United States of America. Their business represents an investment of about \$70,000,000,000. Theirs is the basic industry of our country and is the foundation of all permanent prosperity.

Having given a great deal of study to this question in the last five or six years, and having helped report on three different occasions bills to this House for consideration by the House, I naturally feel somewhat, I will not say angry, but mentally disturbed, when I read morning after morning in the great agricultural paper of this city, the Washington Post [laughter], such highly illuminating editorials as have appeared in its columns recently. They hardly seem worthy of a great metropolitan newspaper such as the Post. They seek to wave aside this all-important question by the mere suggestion that it is unworkable; that it is unsound; and are capped with the supreme clinching argument furnished by the distinguished feather-bed farmer who writes these editorials that the passage of this bill will in the end mean the saddling onto the American consumer a greater burden than he now bears.

I want to deny, gentlemen of the House—and my denial is based upon my investigation and study of this problem—I want to deny that the enactment of the McNary-Haugen bill will increase the cost of living to the American consumer. I want to follow that denial with this statement, that if it does increase the cost of living it is justified by every rule of common sense, equity, and justice.

If I follow the logic of the gentleman who writes these defamatory articles—I mean if I follow his judgment by my vote—I must send word back to the farmers in my district in Indiana and the Middle West that rather than inconvenience the consumers of this country we must have our farmers raise the food of this Nation at a loss. I am unwilling by my voice or vote to subscribe to any such doctrine.

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

Mr. PURNELL. I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman in general debate, but I can not yield in the short time I have.

Gentlemen, the problem that is before you now and the one that will be brought before you if this rule is adopted is the

greatest problem that has ever confronted the American Congress since the beginning of this Government, namely, the problem of restoring agriculture to a place of equality with industry and labor; and if I can interpret the signs of the time, if I can correctly interpret the sentiment of the Congress of the United States in both branches as it reflects the sentiment of the country, I believe that we can say to the distressed agriculturists of this country that we are at last about to put upon the statute books of this country a piece of legislation that will bring about that equality to which they are so justly entitled. [Applause.]

Gentlemen, I want to say a word about this bill, although, perhaps, it would be more proper in general debate or later when we take up the bill under the five-minute rule.

I want to call your attention first of all to the declaration of policy. I want to read it, I want you to digest it, and I want you to understand it.

It is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress to promote the orderly marketing of basic agricultural commodities in interstate and foreign commerce, and to that end to provide for the control and disposition of surpluses of such commodities, to prevent such surpluses from unduly depressing the prices obtained for such commodities, to enable producers of such commodities to stabilize their markets against undue and excessive fluctuations, to preserve advantageous domestic markets for such commodities, to minimize speculation and waste in marketing such commodities, and to encourage the organization of producers of such commodities into cooperative marketing associations.

Gentlemen, no higher declaration of purpose and no more laudable declaration of purpose was ever incorporated in any bill that has ever been passed by the American Congress.

To accomplish this purpose, gentlemen, we establish, first of all, under the provisions of this bill a Federal farm board. Objection is sometimes urged to giving the American farmer a board in Washington to which he may turn for advice and counsel upon the theory that we already have the Agricultural Department. It is true that we have an Agricultural Department, and that primarily it serves agriculture. We have spent millions upon millions, and we are spending millions every year through the Department of Agriculture for the purpose of aiding the farmer in producing more and better crops, but we have at last reached the point in this country where we must now begin the serious study of a greater problem, that of disposing of the surpluses which we have taught these American farmers how to raise. Therefore they are entitled to have in the Capital of their Nation a Federal farm board organized primarily for the purpose of helping them to orderly and profitably market that surplus which we have helped them produce.

I want to invite your attention, gentlemen, to the method of selecting this farm board. If you will have a mental picture of the United States with its 12 Federal land-bank districts before you, you will have the underlying basis and foundation for the organization of that board. If this bill becomes a law, it becomes the duty of the Secretary of Agriculture within 30 days to designate in these several Federal land-bank districts such farm organizations and cooperative organizations as are representative of the farmers and producers and to apportion among them a certain vote which they are to later cast in a convention called by the Secretary of Agriculture for the purpose of forming a nominating committee of five members. Four of the members of this nominating committee are named by the farm organizations themselves. The fifth member is selected by the Secretary of Agriculture. These five members, constituting the nominating committee, then select from the great body of producers in their respective land-bank districts three representative men, whose names are submitted to the President of the United States. When all of the several districts have made their nominations of three each, the President of the United States will have before him the names of 36 men from whom he may choose 12, 1 from each district, to compose this Federal farm board. More than that, as a further precaution and as a further effort to make this board in its actions reflect the sentiment of the farmers and producers of the country, there is provided a commodity advisory council of seven members, to be selected by the board. There will be a cotton advisory council; there will be a corn advisory council; a wheat advisory council; a rice advisory council; and a swine advisory council, each composed of seven men representing these basic commodities, who shall work in cooperation with the Federal board in its effort to take care of the surpluses and orderly and effectively market them.

Now, gentlemen, what are the powers of this board after it is created? I can only touch upon them, but whenever the board finds, first, that there is or may be during the ensuing year either a surplus above the domestic requirements for

wheat, corn, rice, or swine, or a surplus above the requirements for the orderly marketing of cotton, or of wheat, corn, rice, or swine, and, second—and exceedingly important—whenever that board finds that both the advisory council hereinafter created for the commodity and a substantial number of cooperative associations or other organizations representing the producers of the commodity favor the full cooperation of the board in the stabilization of the commodity, then the board shall publicly declare its findings. But they still do not declare an operating period, nor do they set this machinery in motion until one further thing happens.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. PURNELL. One other thing must happen. They shall not commence or terminate operations in any basic agricultural commodity unless members of the board representing Federal land-bank districts which in the aggregate produced during the preceding crop year, according to the estimates of the Department of Agriculture, more than 50 per cent of such commodity vote in favor thereof. They must have an affirmative vote so stating.

Gentlemen, that is briefly the purpose of this board. From time to time during this debate those of us who favor this bill will gladly explain exactly what we mean by this equalization fee and exactly how it is proposed to collect it.

Let me say this in conclusion, gentlemen: Many organizations and classes representing various branches of industry and labor have come before the American Congress since the beginning of this Government asking for relief. I undertake to say, however, that this is the first time in the history of this Government that any organization ever came before Congress asking for relief and asking to have machinery set up to do the things which they can not do for themselves and in the same breath offer to pay out of their own pockets the cost of its operation. [Applause.]

So, gentlemen, I hope we shall quickly adopt this resolution as it is presented by our Committee on Rules, in order that we may immediately begin the consideration of this most important bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has again expired.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for one hour.

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker, I have never felt it was improper in discussing a rule, which provides for the consideration of a great measure like this, to submit observations which in a general way effect the merits of the proposed legislation. I have never been much of a stickler in the observance of technicalities anyway. I shall, therefore, submit for the consideration of the House some of the objections which to my mind make the so-called Haugen bill an impossible piece of legislation. [Applause.]

It is said that an ancient barbarian despot ordered lashes and fetters for the Hesperians. Equally vain, equally futile, is any attempt by legislation to fix prices of any agricultural commodity in violation of the world-wide operation of economic law. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I returned to this session of Congress in the hope that I could vote for some farm-relief legislation. Three great measures intended to help agriculture are receiving the attention of the Nation's legislators. I refer to the Aswell bill, the Crisp-Curtis bill, and the Haugen bill. I have read all three of these measures very carefully. I regret exceedingly that the bill which bristles with the most fatal objections is the bill which appears to have the largest support and is the only bill which comes here with a favorable report from the Committee on Agriculture.

I am going to say at the outset that I am firm in the belief that if the Haugen bill becomes a law the condition of the people I have the honor to represent will not only not be helped but may be positively injured.

I shall discuss a few of the provisions of this bill about which there appears to be little or no controversy. In the first place, it is a price-fixing measure; and that is not all; the fixing of the price, in effect, is left to a board of 13 men without any guarantee whatsoever that the price put in operation by the board will be a profitable price to cotton farmers throughout the entire cotton-producing section of the Nation.

Now, let us examine the effect of the proposed bill. Let us suppose that the Federal farm board is created. The Presi-

dent appoints one man from each of the 12 land-bank districts, the Secretary of Agriculture being ex officio a member of this board. The board decides that conditions are such that they will proceed to stabilize the cotton market at a minimum and maximum price in accordance with the provisions of the bill. As long as this operation continues the price which the farmer will receive for his cotton and cottonseed as well is undoubtedly fixed by the action of this board. I think nobody will deny this statement. Now, let us discuss for a moment the effect of the action of the board. Let me ask what guaranty has the cotton farmer in my State, for instance, that the price fixed by the board will be a remunerative price? Absolutely none. Indeed, the price fixed by the Federal farm board might be a price which would guarantee a profit to a cotton farmer in the State of Texas or Mississippi or Louisiana, while it would inflict a loss which would put the cotton farmer of North Carolina out of business. Now, why do I say this? I stated to a gentleman, a supporter of this bill, the other day that in my opinion the cost of producing a pound of cotton in North Carolina was not less than 15 cents. It is, as a matter of fact, I believe, more than 15 cents, but I wanted to be conservative. The gentleman to whom I made this statement was so disgusted that I would not care to put his reply in print. I will say that a part of his reply was that I must take him to be a fool if I thought he would believe any such statement. The cotton farmer who does me the honor to read this speech can decide for himself whether I put the cost of producing a pound of cotton in North Carolina—that is to say, 15 cents—too high or too low.

My belief is that the average cost of producing cotton in North Carolina since the World War is 17 cents per pound. Now, take the State of Texas with its millions of acres of fertile land, which need no commercial fertilizer to stimulate the growth of the cotton plant. It seems to be generally conceded that under favorable conditions cotton can be produced in the fertile lands of Texas and Mississippi and other parts of the South, at 9 cents per pound. Now, there is no guarantee whatsoever that the Federal farm board in stabilizing the price of cotton would take the cost production price in North Carolina as a basis. Bear in mind that only three members of the Federal farm board can come from cotton-producing sections. If, under the operations of the Federal farm board the North Carolina cotton farmer is to receive a profit for the cotton he produces, the stabilized price must be above the North Carolina cost of production. If the North Carolina cost of production is 17 cents, as I think it is, and as many men who have investigated cost production think it is, then the stabilized price put in operation by the Federal farm board must be above 17 cents. There is absolutely no guarantee of any kind in any line in the bill from beginning to end that this would be done. If the board should decide to put in operation a stabilized price under 17 cents, then the North Carolina farmer would be put out of business by the operation of the very board created for the purpose of helping the cotton industry.

In the Haugen bill, which was defeated in the last session of Congress, there was a guarantee of a remunerative price to the grain producers of the Nation because the bill provided in terms that the stabilized price should be the world price of grain, plus transportation charges and so forth, plus tariff rates. This also applied to cotton, but as there is no tariff on the bulk of the cotton produced in the cotton section it could be readily seen that there was no guarantee that the cotton farmers of the Nation would receive a profit even if the stabilized price were put in operation. To my mind the bill we are now considering is even worse than the bill which was defeated in the last Congress. Let every farmer, who does me the honor to read these remarks, keep constantly in mind that if this bill passes, he commits his destiny to the Federal farm board, composed of 13 members, and that there will never be a time when more than three members of the board can come from the cotton-producing sections. I wonder if the cotton farmers of the South are willing to take this risk. I wonder if, in the spring when he begins to break his soil, in the summer when he is toiling under the broiling sun, he must have the consciousness every minute of the time that the price of his product is to be fixed by 13 men sitting in Washington who can kill or make alive.

I have heard it suggested that the effect of the action taken by the Federal farm board might be to restrict the production of cotton of those States particularly adapted by nature to the raising of cotton. The suggestion has been made that the operation of the board might tend to restrict acreage. If the board should decide to stabilize the price of cotton at a point between the cost of production in North Carolina and the cost of production in Texas, the inevitable result would be that nobody

could profitably raise cotton in North Carolina. It can also be readily seen that a profit of 2 cents per pound to the North Carolina farmer would be a profit of about 11 cents per pound to the cotton farmer of Texas. I believe the cotton farmers of North Carolina prefer to take their chances upon a market which is governed by the world-wide law of supply and demand rather than submit the fate of their industry to 13 men appointed by the President of the United States.

Now, let us consider another serious objection to this bill. Before any farmer can have any say-so in making nominations for appointment by the President of the members of the Federal farm board he must join some cooperative association already in existence, or to be hereafter formed if this bill becomes a law. The bill contemplates that the farmer must join some farm organization which conforms to the provisions of the proposed legislation. It is said that about 8 per cent of the cotton farmers of the Nation belong to cooperative farm associations at this time. Therefore, in order to participate in nominations for members of the Federal farm board 92 per cent of the cotton farmers of the Nation must hereafter join some cotton cooperative association or else have no participation whatsoever in creating the board. Now, whether these men wish to join or not I will not undertake to say; I do say that no legislation should be passed by Congress which in effect requires them to join any organization of any kind. We already have too many laws affecting the liberty of the citizens. It may be we have already passed the danger point. Certainly we should not pass any law which has for its very purpose the forcing of the cotton farmer to do something he may not voluntarily wish to do. But this is not the worst feature of the bill. A still worse feature is yet to be considered. Not only does the bill contemplate that the cotton producers of the Nation must join some cotton cooperative association; it gives to the 13 men constituting the Federal farm board in the city of Washington, the right to impose a tax called an equalization fee, the amount of which is not limited, and this tax must be paid on every bale of cotton produced in the Nation, either at the gin or by the railroad company or by the factory.

It is a tax upon the product of every cotton farmer in the Nation. What will be the amount of this equalization fee? It may be \$2, it may be \$5. It can be fixed at \$20 per bale. I have heard the suggestion repeatedly made that the equalization fee might be as large as \$10 per bale. Let it be remembered that there will be no escape from the payment of this equalization fee, unless the collection of the fee is declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court of the United States. I think the fee is unconstitutional. I do not believe Congress has any such power, but I am unwilling to take the risk. I believe the cotton farmers of the district I have the honor to represent are unwilling to take the risk. Already they are burdened with taxes. How, in Heaven's name, do you expect to bring prosperity to any man by putting additional taxes upon him. You might as well expect a man to lift himself from this floor by pulling at his boot straps as to expect to bring prosperity to the cotton farmers of the South by putting an additional tax upon the products of the farm. [Applause.]

Let there be no mistake about this provision in the bill. I say in the case of cotton, under the language of the bill, every pound of the cotton harvested will be subject to a fee, and I further charge that the amount of the equalization fee is subject to the action of the Federal farm board of 13 members seated in the city of Washington, of whom only three can come from the cotton-producing sections of the Nation.

Never in the history of this Nation has any law been passed which confers upon any body of men the power which will be exercised by the proposed Federal farm board. If Congress has ever conferred upon any governmental body as many and as great uncontrolled powers as are conferred by House bill 15474, known as the Haugen bill, now being considered by this House, nobody has ever yet been able to find the precedent.

Mr. Speaker, I have made some observations with respect to certain major objections of this bill. The bill is faulty in many respects which limited time forbids that I discuss at all. I will venture to suggest that the passage of the bill will require a great army of Federal officials, all of whom must be paid. What the number of this official army would be it is difficult to predict at this time. Suffice it to say that thousands will be needed and that the Federal farm board would have a representative in every community, certainly at every gin selected by the Federal farm board, to receive cotton in the seed. Whether the Federal farm board would select more than one gin in any community is a question no one can decide in advance, of course. But let it not be forgotten that the Federal farm board, if this bill passes, will have absolute authority to select one gin in each community, and that the cotton farmers of that community could not as a practical proposition

have their cotton ginned at any gin which had not been selected by the Federal farm board. This board, sitting in Washington, could bring prosperity to one gin plant in a community, while it could put out of business every other gin plant in such community. If it selected all of the gin plants in any particular county, then it must have a representative at each and every gin plant. I say such power should not be given to any set of men. It is a power to kill or make alive. The same power applies to the common carrier. The Federal farm board can give preference to one common carrier to the great damage of another common carrier.

I can not believe that certain people who have asked me to support this bill have fully considered its provisions. I can not believe that certain gentlemen who are asking me to support this bill realize that it bristles with so many fatal objections. The good God in heaven knows my heart. He knows my intentions. He knows that I want to help the toilers of America. I know the hardships of the farm. I have toiled many a day from sunrise to sunset during my boyhood. If there is any work on the farm I have not done, I do not know what it is. I know perfectly well that the hardest dollar any man ever earned is the dollar he digs out of the ground. I deny that any living man has the interest of the farmer more sincerely at heart than I have. If I thought this bill would bring to the farmers of America any reasonable degree of prosperity, I believe I would vote for it. The bill is not in harmony with the principles I have cherished for a lifetime, but I believe I would cast consistency to the winds and vote for the bill if I thought it was workable and if I thought it would bring any degree of prosperity, but I believe the contrary is true. I believe the bill might spell disaster rather than prosperity to the farmers of my State. [Applause.]

In conclusion—

First. The bill creates a board which in effect has the power to fix the price of cotton and cottonseed so long as operations under this bill continue.

Second. The purpose of the bill is to force the farmers of America to join cooperative agricultural associations. It is true the bill does not in so many words make this a requirement, but I think it can not be denied that the purpose of the bill is to force organization among the farmers whether they voluntarily desire to join farm organizations or not.

Third. It gives to the Federal farm board power to impose and collect an equalization fee, unlimited in amount, upon every bale of cotton raised in America.

Fourth. It creates a great army of Federal employees, all of whom must be paid in the end by the very industries it is sought to help.

Mr. Speaker, those who are honored with service in this body can not properly lose sight of the fact that they represent all the people of America. We represent not only the producer but the consumer as well. I have tried to point out the danger to the cotton farmer in States like North Carolina, for instance, where the cost of producing cotton is so much higher than in States like Texas. It is entirely possible that the stabilized price of cotton fixed by the Federal farm board might mean disaster to the cotton farmers of my State, but there is an additional objection. If this bill is passed it means a higher price to every consumer of wheat or rice or swine or corn. It means a higher price for every loaf of bread consumed, for every pound of rice, and for every pound of pork.

Mr. Speaker, my service in this body has extended over a quarter of a century. When I was first elected I was a young man. To-day my eyes are turned to the setting sun. During that quarter of a century, I call my Father in heaven to witness that there has never been one hour when I have lost sight of the interest of the toilers of this Nation. If I have ever voted against their interest, it was a mistake of the head and not of the heart. If my vote upon this measure means the end of my public service, I can only say to the splendid people who have kept me here so long that I am voting now as I have always voted, and always shall vote, in accordance with the convictions of my conscience as Almighty God has given me light to see. If I am to be punished for pursuing this course, I will have the consciousness to my dying day that I have been punished for what Edward W. Pot believes to be right.

In conclusion, I appeal from the threat of the lobbyist, who has a selfish interest in the passage of this bill, to the great constituency who have always trusted me in the past, and whom I ask to trust me now. I appeal from the threat of the men who expect to hold office under this bill to the farmers of the district I represent, who only expect a square deal, who only ask a square deal, and who are entitled to a square deal. I ask the people who have kept me here so long to believe me when I say now that I am doing what I believe to be right. Sometimes it is easier to say yes than no. During

25 years I have cast no vote which was not in accordance with my honest convictions. No man can point to any vote of mine as a Member of this great body which was cast for the purpose of making myself more popular. I say in all sincerity and truth that I wish I could see my way clear to vote for this bill. I have no criticism for those who are supporting the bill, but I simply can not vote for it, because I believe it might spell ruin and not prosperity to the people I represent. Feeling this way about it, if I did not have the courage of my convictions, I would not be fit to occupy a seat in this body for one single day. [Applause.]

If I am about to make a mistake, I ask my people at home to believe what I know to be the truth, and that is that I am doing now just what I have always tried to do, and that is voting my honest convictions. [Applause.]

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, will not the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POU] yield further time now?

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BEGG].

Mr. BURTON. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BEGG].

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I wish I could find myself in a position to be in accord with those supporting this McNary-Haugen bill. I hardly think it necessary for me to express the fact, not because I am out of sympathy with this bill, that every blood relative I have in the world is a farmer, and my district is at least 60 per cent men and women living on the farm and making their daily bread therefrom. Consequently, if I at all were interested in self-preservation I would be for the things that would do the most for those people, and if I were convinced at all that my people in Ohio—and I will say the people of the country, because occasionally I try to take a broad view of it—would be benefited by this legislation I would subordinate any view I had and be for it. Now, for the benefit of my colleagues in Ohio, because I am not sure you have received the same kind of information I have, I want to read, at least, a part of two letters. I desire to read that part of a letter which came to me yesterday. This is a letter from Mr. C. A. Dyer, and the letterhead says he is legislative agent of the grange in Ohio, and it reads as follows:

FEBRUARY 7, 1927.

Hon. JAMES T. BEGG,

Room 14, the Capitol, Washington, D. C.

DEAR FRIEND BEGG: I notice in the daily papers that the McNary-Haugen bill will probably be up for consideration in both Houses of Congress this week.

As you know, Congressman BRAND and I debated this question at the meeting of the Ohio State Grange at its annual session at Dayton, Ohio, on December 14. The next day the question of farm relief was voted on by the State grange and that body unanimously adopted a resolution in favor of the debenture plan with certain reservations. I am inclosing a copy of this resolution.

On February 1 the State Farm Bureau Federation of Ohio held its annual meeting. At this annual meeting the question of indorsing the McNary-Haugen bill was put squarely up to the delegates. When the vote was taken, out of a delegate body of 133 delegates, only 16 stood up and recorded themselves as in favor of the McNary-Haugen bill, this after advocates of this measure, both from within and without the State, had campaigned vigorously for it for two days among the delegates.

Now, that is a letter of the State grange. I wanted that to be in the RECORD for the information of the boys from Ohio who want to help the farm organizations.

Now, this is the second letter, and it is from the president of the Ohio Farmers Bureau, Mr. Palmer, who says:

FEBRUARY 5, 1927.

Representative JAMES T. BEGG,

House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE BEGG: We have tried to keep you informed in the past as to how the rural people in Ohio were thinking; that is, of course, to the best of our knowledge. While we may not have interpreted sentiment rightly at times, we have tried to pass it on just as we gathered it. In line with this desire we are writing to inform you of the action taken in regard to national legislation by the delegate body and our board of directors at our annual meeting held on January 31 and February 1, and trust that it may be of some assistance to you in your further efforts in connection with these measures.

Our meeting was, I believe, the best yet, and a better spirit of harmony prevailed among all groups than ever before. Eighty-six counties were represented, with 142 authorized delegates seated.

"Resolved, That by reason of the present acute depression in agriculture we earnestly request the National Congress and the President to pass the McNary-Haugen bill now before Congress, that farmers

may have the same degree of protection accorded other major industries of our country."

When a roll-call vote was taken, 16 delegates voted to approve the resolution and 116 voted against approval.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Nebraska. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEGG. I can not yield; I am sorry.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Nebraska. For one question.

Mr. BEGG. Now, that is the sentiment in Ohio among the representatives of the agricultural associations as it is gathered through their organization, sent to me over the signature, first, from the grange and, second, from the president of the Ohio Farm Bureau Federation. Now, I want to reason with the proponents of this Haugen bill for a couple of minutes, and if I am in error in my reasoning, then I want them to prove the error to this House.

This is called a price stabilization bill. It can not be a stabilization bill, because the minute the local price fails to fluctuate with the foreign price, whenever the differential between the foreign and local price becomes greater than the tariff on a commodity, the United States becomes a world market for all commodities produced, or else you are giving to the farm board the power to make a tariff on imports. No advocate of the bill will admit that we are granting tariff-making powers to this board.

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEGG. I can not.

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. The gentleman is wrong, and I will tell you why you are wrong.

Mr. BEGG. I refuse to yield.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio declines to yield.

Mr. BEGG. Now the gentleman from Iowa has spoken at least two hours on this proposition, and I have the generous time of 15 minutes. If the gentleman can get me more time I will engage in debate at any time. Now, let us go on through and take the next step. There are \$250,000,000 put into the revolving fund. What for? To enable the purchase of the surplus crop. Now, let us see what will happen. I am going to take wheat because it is easily illustrated. There is not a line in here saying what they are going to make the differential on wheat, so in order to make my illustration understandable, I am assuming they are going to increase the price of wheat whenever they set the price of 50 cents upon it in the world market.

That may not be the rate they settle upon, but we will assume it for the sake of illustration. Now under the present order of marketing there are a great number of farmers who store their wheat in the bin from the thresher, holding it for a rise in the market. If this scheme is put into effect there will be no inducement for a farmer to store a bushel, but on the other hand there will be an inducement not to store it and to save thereby the cost of storing it in the bin and then taking it out again, because when he has it on the wagon to haul to the bin he can proceed to haul it to market without an additional charge. Hence if this should become a law and a price established by the board in May, every farmer when he threshes a bushel of wheat will haul it to the market right away, and if he does that, how much is going to be a surplus on an 800,000,000-bushel crop?

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

Mr. BEGG. No; I can not yield.

If that thing were brought about, the first wheat crop begins to flow on the market along in May some time, and the last of it in September, practically. There might be a variation of a week or two. There are five months in which they must absorb 800,000,000 bushels, because it will all be marketed. Who is going to buy it? There is no inducement for the millers, the processors of the product, to go into the market and buy to-day so as to be sure not to be required to pay over \$1.50 a bushel.

Why do I make that statement? Simply because the board that bought up this wheat must sell it in the world's market, and if the processor of the wheat did not buy in July for August consumption, all he has to do is to go into the market and buy the wheat that is sold by the board in the world market, and bring it back and pay the tariff, which will make the same price as that at which the board bought it. Where will be the board's profit?

If anybody can prove that that will work out in practice other than I have described, he can show me something in business and mathematics that I can not put through my head. How much will they buy—this board? They will buy all the world crop that is not consumed on the farm, and \$250,000,000 will not be a circumstance as a revolving fund, as working

capital, for an organization that is going into the market, not to buy the surplus, because it has to buy every bushel that is offered, and every bushel that is harvested will be offered on the market.

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

Mr. BEGG. No; I do not yield.

Mr. BURTNESS. Does the gentleman contend that the price will be the same all the year round, and that that is the purpose of the bill?

Mr. BEGG. No; it can not be that.

Mr. BURTNESS. Is not your whole argument based on the idea that the price will be the same throughout the year?

Mr. BEGG. No. I said very definitely that the price had to fluctuate with the world fluctuation, and therefore it could not be a stationary proposition. According to all the dictionaries I have ever read, "stabilize" means to fix or bring into a rigid position or balanced.

Mr. BURTNESS. But you turn around and say there will be no chance for an increase of price in holding it.

Mr. BEGG. I can not yield. My time is limited. I want to do a little bit more of what I choose to call reasoning, the best I can do. Now, this board of 12 members, appointed out of a list of 36; this list of 36 is nominated by a list of 60. The 60 are elected in a convention out of 10 per cent of the farmers of this country. I would not be so much averse if you were going to include in the control and management all the farmers. But you absolutely eliminate 90 per cent of the farmers, and you say that you are going to make it a closed corporation.

What will happen? This board has to be either a public, a governmental board, or a private board. It can not be anything between. It must be one or the other. If it is to be a private board, I want some gentleman favoring this bill to tell me how a private corporation can assess and collect this equalization fee, or whatever you want to call it, from a man who is not a member of a farm organization? I want that information before I am ready to vote. I do not think it is a private board. I think it is a public board. If it is a public board, I have another question to propound to you. If it is a public board, it is a governmental agency. I would like somebody to tell me the method that the United States Government has for raising money other than by taxation.

Now this board is empowered to do what? Raise money. What for? To pay its overhead, plus making up certain deficits in certain operations. How can any Government agency in the world, in our form of government, raise money other than by a tax? If I am correct in my logic so far, and if this equalization fee is a tax, what clause in the Constitution gives the right to Congress to delegate to a board of any class of people the power to levy a direct tax on the majority?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. BEGG. I want one more minute. That is all I ask.

Mr. BURTON. I yield to the gentleman one minute more.

Mr. BEGG. I have offered these propositions to you for your serious consideration. I wish I had an hour in which to discuss them. The ramifications of this subject are indefinite. Some men with whom I have talked in private favor the bill under the mistaken belief that this proposed board will resemble the Interstate Commerce Commission. There is no more similarity between the Interstate Commerce Commission and this proposition than there is between black and white.

The Interstate Commerce Commission would not have any authority to levy a cent of tax on me for the purpose of raising their own salaries or the salaries of their own employees. It would not have any power to tax me under any circumstances unless I chose to ride on the road. Then they can not tax me for that privilege but can set the maximum the railroad can charge me. What for? To operate the road but not to put money back into my pocket, and that is the whole scheme of this bill.

Let me say in conclusion, men, I regret that the atmosphere of politics has crept into this thing. A question as vital and as big as I think this is, affecting the very fundamentals of the Government, should be reasoned out by Congressmen in their sober moments and not urged for any reason of political advancement or political preferment either of themselves or their party. It is serious, and if I can read the Constitution it is the furthest departure from it that was ever advocated by any country in the world this side of Russia. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has again expired.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Crisp]. [Applause.]

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, I am going to discuss the rule and not the legislation. I have always

played fair and square with the membership of this House, and never have I sought in any way to keep any of my colleagues from having a bill in which they were intensely interested passed upon by the House. I have not always been able to support their measures, but I have always been willing for them to have the House pass upon them; and I am appealing to you to-day to give me the privilege, by a full expression with a roll call, of having the House pass its judgment on the bill I had the honor to introduce. I have worked laboriously day in and day out and into the night on that bill, believing it was the solution of the distressed agricultural situation. I may be wrong as to that. I would not expect, neither do I desire, any Member of this House to vote for that bill unless it appeals to his judgment, but I am asking you to give the House an opportunity to pass upon it. Of course, I can offer it as an amendment in the Committee of the Whole, which I shall do; but you know and I know you can not get a full expression in the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, for the Members do not stay here, and there is no record vote in the Committee of the Whole.

Now, gentlemen, the distinguished gentlemen from North Carolina and from Alabama stated that this legislation was of paramount importance, and I thoroughly agree, for I have never known Congress to be called upon to pass on legislation of greater interest to the whole country.

There are three bills proposed, and all are sincerely and earnestly advocated. My distinguished friend the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ASWELL] has a bill, and, being on the Agricultural Committee, he is entitled to preferential recognition to make a motion to recommit. I have stated publicly and I have stated privately that if his bill is offered I will vote for it; and if the judgment of the House substitutes it for the Haugen bill, which I can not support because I believe it unjust to my people and unconstitutional, I am content, and will not offer my bill as a substitute for his. I apprehend that most of my own colleagues over here, who are conscientiously opposed to the Haugen bill, will vote either for Doctor ASWELL'S bill or mine, but I believe, owing to the difference in those bills, there are a number of my colleagues on this side of the Chamber—Republican—who would vote for my bill but not for Doctor ASWELL'S bill.

Gentlemen, I am only asking you to give the House an opportunity to pass on the three measures. Under the rule presented by the Committee on Rules only one motion to recommit is in order. The practical effect of that rule, if adopted, will be that the gentleman from Louisiana, and properly so, he being on the Committee on Agriculture, will have the right to make a motion to recommit embodying his bill. If it should be defeated, then the House will have no opportunity whatever to pass upon the bill I have introduced with a record vote.

I am going to ask the House to vote down the previous question on the rule. If the House votes down the previous question, I shall offer an amendment to it providing that two motions to recommit may be entertained by the Speaker. The only effect of that, gentlemen, is, if the House desires, to give the House an opportunity to pass on all three bills. It does not interfere with the consideration of the Haugen bill. It only defers the consideration of the Haugen bill about 30 minutes, the time necessary to call the roll and give the House an opportunity to vote.

Gentlemen, it may be urged that it might set a bad precedent to have two motions to recommit. What is the function of the Rules Committee? The function of the Rules Committee is, when exigencies exist, to come in and suspend the rules so as to give the House a fair opportunity to express itself on legislation. The Committee on Rules has brought in rules making the House vote in one vote to disagree to hundreds of amendments, ask a conference with the Senate, and appoint conferees without intervening motion. Rules have been brought in making legislation in order that violated the rules. The Committee on Rules on this very bill and in this Congress brought in a rule authorizing the substitution of two other bills for this bill. Now, gentlemen, I do not consider that to vote with me to vote down the previous question will be a test as to the respective bills. I appeal to a number of my friends who are supporting the Haugen bill to give me a square deal and to give me a chance. [Applause.] You claim to have 50 majority for it. Then surely, surely you are not afraid for the House to have a record vote on my bill.

I appeal to my own colleagues. Gentlemen, I have always been regular on party matters and I have always cooperated with my colleagues. Not one of you can truthfully say I have ever interfered with you or tried to stop you from having a measure close to your hearts voted on. I appeal to you to give me that same consideration and vote with me to vote down the previous question on this rule. [Applause.]

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRISP. I yield.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I understood the gentleman's reason for insisting there should be two motions to recommit was based on the fact that we never secure in the Committee of the Whole a representative vote.

Mr. CRISP. A record vote or a representative vote.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I thought the gentleman said a representative vote.

Mr. CRISP. I said both—a record vote and a representative vote.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Then, if the gentleman's position is sound we should adopt the suggestion of the gentleman in reference to every important measure.

Mr. CRISP. I will say to my friend that if any measure of as vital importance as this comes up and two bills in the committee receive 10 votes each on the question of substituting them for the bill you are called upon to pass on; yes. Ten members of the Committee on Agriculture favored the bill of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ASWELL], over the Haugen bill, and 10 members of the committee favored my bill over the Haugen bill, and only 11 voted for the Haugen bill and under those conditions I think it is nothing but fair to the House to give the House a chance by a record vote to pass on all three of them.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. The gentleman is aware of the fact there is another bill pending beside those the gentleman has alluded to. What opportunity would the gentleman give to the other party who believes he has the best bill?

Mr. CRISP. I have not heard the other gentleman insisting on his bill and, frankly, I have never heard the other gentleman seriously contending for his bill.

Mr. DOWELL. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CRISP. I will.

Mr. DOWELL. Is it the purpose of the gentleman to substitute his bill for the Aswell bill in his motion to recommit?

Mr. CRISP. For the Haugen bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. BEGG]. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, before the debate goes further, if I may have the attention of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], I would like to see just the situation we are in. How much time has the gentleman from Ohio?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio has 35 minutes and the gentleman from North Carolina has 10 minutes remaining.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. As we have the time here, the gentleman from North Carolina has 21 minutes remaining.

Mr. BURTON. The Chair is correct, I may say. I have kept account of the time, and 10 minutes remain to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POW].

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Has the Chair verified his statement of the time remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from North Carolina has 10 minutes remaining and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] 35 minutes.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. May I ask the gentleman from Ohio whether he intends to reserve further time and permit some other gentleman to be recognized?

Mr. BURTON. I intend to yield further time.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I am wondering if this might not be the right stage to do that. Of course, the gentleman has not used so very much of his time, but so far as the gentleman from North Carolina is concerned, he seems to have but 10 minutes remaining. If there is to be a carrying out of an agreement among the Members that some of those who are opposed to all three bills shall have some time, of course, we ought to know that now, so that the gentleman from North Carolina may be able fully to keep faith with any Member to whom he has promised to yield.

Mr. BURTON. The question might arise, if the gentleman from North Carolina does not exhaust his 60 minutes by consecutive assignments, whether he does not yield the floor. I would suggest that if the gentleman will yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LUCE], then I will yield 10 minutes in recompense to the gentleman from North Carolina after the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LUCE] has spoken.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Then we will be able to get some time after some other gentleman has occupied the floor?

Mr. BURTON. There will only be 10 minutes left after the gentleman from North Carolina assigns that amount of time.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. But I understand some other gentleman is going to obtain an hour.

Mr. BURTON. That I do not know.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I would like to submit this parliamentary question to the Chair: In the event the gentleman from North Carolina does not yield all of his time consecutively so as to consume the entire hour, would the gentleman thereby be deprived of yielding time later after the recognition of some other gentleman?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In view of the understanding that is apparent everywhere, the present occupant of the chair would recognize the gentleman from North Carolina at a later time.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I will say to the gentleman from Ohio there are some gentlemen on this side who desire some time against all three measures. I refer to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HUDDLESTON] and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. DEAL]. They would like to have as much as 20 minutes each. I understood the gentleman from Massachusetts was in the same attitude and also desired 20 minutes. I think if some gentleman will take recognition for one hour now and let us divide that time we will have all these matters settled.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Let me suggest that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] propounded a unanimous-consent request to extend the time which he has and the request may go through, making his request for such time as the gentleman thinks will be needed.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. That will be entirely agreeable to me. Whether consent will be given, of course, I can not say.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, in order to bring the matter to a head, I ask unanimous consent that the time for discussion on this resolution be extended 40 minutes, to be controlled by myself, with the understanding that I must give half of that time to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. TINCHER. Is that in addition to the time the gentleman already has?

Mr. BURTON. That is two hours.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent that his time of one hour be extended 40 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, there has been no provision in the rule for those opposed to all this legislation, but if I am assured by colleague the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ASWELL] that in the general debate on this bill I will have 20 minutes, I shall not object; otherwise I shall be compelled to object.

Mr. ASWELL. I have as many requests for time now as I will have time to yield.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Is the gentleman from Maryland aware of the fact that in this debate on the rule nearly all the time has been taken up by those opposed to the McNary-Haugen bill?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Why should I agree to this when there is no time provided for those opposed to this legislation?

Mr. RAMSEYER. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that in the debate on the rule nearly all the time has been taken up by gentlemen opposed to the bill.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I object.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a parliamentary inquiry of the Chair. If some one seeks the floor opposing both bills under the present parliamentary situation, would he be entitled to an hour?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The present occupant of the chair would so hold. The Chair will recognize anyone seeking recognition until the gentleman from Ohio moves the previous question.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the bill and ask for recognition.

Mr. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask for one hour in opposition to the rule.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LUCE] is recognized for one hour.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, I understand that I still have control of 35 minutes and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POW], in cooperation with me, has 10 minutes, which will be available after the gentleman from Massachusetts is through.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will so hold.

Mr. BURTON. I trust that the gentleman from Massachusetts will give a part of his hour to those who take the same stand which he takes in opposition to the bill.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Will the gentleman yield for an inquiry? Inasmuch as the gentleman from Massachusetts will have control of an hour and the gentlemen from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] and North Carolina [Mr. POW] have been liberal in dividing the time to those opposed to the bill as well as those for the

bill, will the gentleman from Massachusetts show the same liberality and parcel out half of his time to those in favor of the bill?

Mr. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, I may say that those in favor of the bills are about to have 12 hours. [Laughter.]

Of course, I shall try to give such time as may be possible to other gentlemen opposed to all the bills. They will have, I think, more than half of the hour. Thus restricting myself, I find it impossible adequately to analyze the three measures, and under the circumstances may, perhaps to the best advantage, confine myself to explaining the attitude of the people of the region which I come from toward the legislation in general.

We are not lacking in sympathy with the plight of the farmers of the West. No reasonable man in the East will begrudge the western farmer a fair return for his labor. I would gladly cooperate in the passage of any measure that would secure such result equitably.

I want to show why the pending proposals would not accomplish that purpose and therefore why they prevent eastern men from giving acceptance. These measures vary in their quality and in their promise. One is distinctly objectionable, another is less objectionable, and the third if properly amended here, or in another branch, would, I think, meet with the approval of the men from the East.

Unable as I am to go into detail as to specific objections, I would strip the husk away and get down to the kernel of the thing. I should like to dwell upon some of the details, for instance, upon the unconstitutionality of the provision that compels the President to restrict his choice of a member of this great board to one out of three nominees in any one district.

There are other things to which I would like to advert, but with justice to other gentlemen who desire to argue the subject, I must confine myself to the core of the question, to the principle involved, to that thing without which all else will fail—to the central problem.

What is at the heart of the present trouble? From what does it all spring? It springs from overproduction, from the fact that in certain years there is far too much of this or that agricultural commodity produced. In other years there is less, to be sure, but always in the case of great staples an excess to the amount of all or some part of the product available for exportation.

The first of these bills, the McNary-Haugen bill, so-called, does nothing to restrict production save in the way of suggesting advice.

The second bill, the Aswell bill, so-called, likewise does nothing to hamper production except by way of advice.

The third bill, the Curtis-Crisp bill, interposes an obstacle to the increase of production by saying that if the acreage is increased after a year of application of the law, then the law shall be suspended; so that the Crisp bill is the only one of the three bills that makes a serious attempt to get at the cause of the trouble.

How does the cause of the trouble operate? I ask you to recall the days when you studied political economy, I ask you to remember what is the basic proposition in all systems of political economy with which I am acquainted. What is it that is underneath wages, underneath prices, underneath rent—the very foundation of the economic structure? It is what is known as the marginal quantity.

If you are not familiar with that word "marginal," let me make it clear to you, or otherwise perhaps you may not understand the effect of the proposals in these bills. The marginal land is that which is brought into or thrown out of cultivation, according as prices rise or fall. It is what determines economic rent; it is what in the long run determines prices.

To take this question out of a somewhat prejudiced atmosphere, let me show you how the law of marginal returns operates with a very few figures relating to the bituminous-coal industry. In 1923 the average spot price of bituminous coal, f. o. b. mines, was \$2.77, a drop from \$3.64 in the preceding year. The result of this drop was that from 1923 to 1924 the number of mines in operation fell from 9,331 to 7,586. The fall in prices closed those mines which were most poorly situated, which were the least profitable. In the next year there was a further drop in the price of coal and again a drop in the number of mines operated, from 7,586 to 7,144. In three years a drop in the price of coal to the extent of \$1.58 a ton led to the closing of 2,155 mines.

That law works in agriculture. If you raise the net price the farmer receives, more land will be cultivated. If you lower the price, less land will be cultivated.

The McNary-Haugen bill can be of no value to the farmer unless it raises the net price that reaches him. If it raises the net price, more acreage will be brought under cultivation. If

more acreage is brought under cultivation, its products can be sold only abroad. If they are sold abroad, they can be sold only at a price which means a loss to the American farmer, producer, or whoever is to bear the loss. It is proposed here that this loss shall be borne by the American consumer, and now the train of my logic brings me to the reason why we oppose legislation of this sort. This process means that you are going to make the cost of production to the foreign industrialist lower than to the American industrialist.

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

Mr. LUCE. I regret that I can not yield. Otherwise, the gentleman might disturb the placid sequence of my logic.

Mr. STEVENSON. The gentleman has omitted the southern product. What effect will it have on that? If they sell 9,000,000 bales abroad cheaper than they do here, what effect will it have on the cotton grower?

Mr. LUCE. To keep on the main track I must not at the moment go off on the side line suggested by the question of my friend from South Carolina, attractive though it be.

I have shown you that this bill can work only if it lowers the price of food to the foreign industrialist and, therefore, only if it handicaps the American manufacturer. The effect of this bill will be to furnish more food more cheaply to the foreign manufacturer by levying upon the American consumer. We contend that this method of solving the difficulties of the farmer is unfair; that it is unrighteous; that it can but react to the damage of the whole country.

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUCE. I can not. I want to show the gentleman how it will react to the damage of his own constituents. We have sympathy for the farmers of the West, not only, I hope, from the common instinct of humanity, but also because it pays for us to have sympathy. The western farmer is our best customer, and we want him to prosper; we want him to be able to buy that which we make. It would be folly for us to come here and share in the enactment of legislation that will injure our customers and make them less able to buy the things that we produce. This bill by stimulating production will do actual harm to the great mass of the farmers of the West, and because of that we protest against its passage, from selfish motives as well as from the more generous motives with which, we hope, we are also inspired.

It has been suggested that through manipulation of the equalization fee somehow this will be avoided. Let me put you on your guard against muddling your brains with details. Get back to first principles. Consider only the fact that if the American consumer has to pay more somebody will receive more or somebody else will pay less. Who will receive more? The farmer, temporarily. Who will pay less? The foreign consumer.

But it is insisted that the McNary-Haugen bill will restrain production by increasing from time to time the equalization fee. Perchance it will; but, mind you, though every time you increase the equalization fee you will thereby lessen the temptation to overproduce, you nevertheless will leave some temptation existing, or else the bill will have brought the farmers no gain. If you leave but one penny of gain to the farmer on the bushel, you will increase the amount of acreage brought under cultivation and, therefore, to that extent increase the harm wrought by the situation when the process began.

Now, I pointed out that the Crisp-Curtis bill attempts, and it is the only pending bill that attempts, to get at and remove the cause of the evil. It declares if the acreage is increased, then the operation of the bill shall be suspended. I can see no reason why that should not be carried further and made more drastic by giving to somebody the power to say that suspension shall follow unless production is diminished to a specified and reasonable extent. It may be practical to do that thing. The example has been set in the Federated Malay States by the working of the Stephenson plan in the matter of rubber. It may not be beyond the power of human ingenuity to accomplish a like result here, and possibly this Crisp-Curtis bill could be amended to reach that end.

I want to iterate and reiterate and reiterate that, until you devise some method to control and limit production, you will not have remedied the situation.

Gentlemen who are friends of the Crisp-Curtis bill pointed out to me that its power to suspend operations may by itself alarm the farmer to the point of restrictive action. Let us see. Suppose we start off with a normal production represented by the number 100. By the time you put into operation this law, say the figure is 120. Suppose, then, the acreage increases to, say, 121. Then the operation of the system is to be discontinued. So far so good. But operation may be still kept up if the acreage has dropped, say, to 119, 118, or 117. So by permitting continued overproduction of important degree you

make it possible to pile up surplus after surplus in year after year until the system is overcome and overthrown.

That is the great danger.

I believe in storehouses and warehouses. I believe we may well bear in mind the dream of the seven fat and the seven lean years that Joseph interpreted and how he stored up the surplus food of Egypt. I believe in that kind of remedy. I want to help it.

I want also to aid cooperation. Particularly would I aid cooperation because it attacks another prime difficulty of this whole situation, the spread between the producer and the consumer, but I do not want to give unsound help by the acceptance of a system wrong in principle, founded upon the sands, sure to collapse, sure to do these cooperatives more harm than good. I honestly predict, confidently predict, anxiously predict, that in the case of the farmer relying on such a system the last state of that man will be worse than the first.

Now I will gladly yield to somebody to reinforce my unanswerable argument. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUCE. How much time?

Mr. HUDDLESTON. May I say to the gentleman, I have no hope of being able to add any color to the rose, but I will ask to have some time.

Mr. LUCE. How much time does the gentleman desire?

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Twenty minutes.

Mr. BURTNESSE. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. LUCE. I think the gentleman from Alabama can answer any question the gentleman may desire to ask. [Applause.]

I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to no one in sympathy for the farmer. I understand his troubles. I understand the causes of his troubles. If I felt that this measure would help the farmer to the extent that its advocates represent, perhaps my attitude would be different; but it is the conviction that under measures of this kind the last condition of the farmer will be worse than the first, which forbids that I should support a bill which is indefensible from the standpoint of principles.

WHAT IS THE MATTER WITH THE FARMER?

To remedy the farmer's distress we must understand what the causes for that distress are. It is the sheerest quackery to undertake to remedy the farmer's bad condition without reference to the causes which have put him in that condition. To treat the disease we must first find the causes and remove the causes.

What is the matter with the farmer anyhow? The chief trouble with him is that for generations he has been discriminated against by law. He has been forced to buy what he needs in protected markets at an artificial price and to sell the products of his labor in competition with all the world. [Applause.] The result is that through the generations the farmer's pockets have been milked and milked by selfish interests of from somewhere between 5 to 15 per cent of his income. Of course he is prostrate. Of course agriculture is languishing to ruin as the result of such a system.

That is one trouble with the farmer. If Representatives of rural constituencies want to do something for the farmer, give him the same kind of a market to buy in that he has to sell in, where the law of supply and demand operates. Give him to buy in a free and open market.

May I say that in my opinion you men of New England who represent manufacturers who are enjoying the advantages of protective tariffs are utterly inconsistent when you demand for your constituents freedom from the laws of competition and yet vote to impose free-trade conditions upon those who are engaged in agriculture. [Applause.] In my judgment, it would be good political strategy on your part to give this—the Haugen bill—to the farmer, because when the farmer finds out that he is not going to get it or that it is impossible to put him on the level with the unjust plane upon which the manufacturers stand—and you can not keep it from him forever, because the farmer has got just as much sense as anybody else—when the light does get to him he will rise and sweep away those special privileges which you enjoy.

Of course, I understand your philosophy. It is that to the degree that any other group is elevated toward your own unjust level, the special advantage which you enjoy is taken away. If every class and group could be raised to the same level by special favors of legislation, all would stand as though no special favor had been granted to any. All would be exactly where they started. And so you fight favors for others and thereby preserve the value of your own unjust advantage. [Applause.]

A PIECE OF CLASS LEGISLATION

This measure is admittedly a piece of class legislation. Its champions admit that their purpose is to benefit only about 10 per cent of our population engaged in the production of

wheat, corn, cotton, rice, tobacco, and swine. That benefit is to be given to those particular farmers by arbitrarily elevating the price of their product, by giving it a forced value, not a value fixed by the law of supply and demand, not a value fixed by economic laws. They purpose to elevate arbitrarily the price of that which he has to sell, and to do it at the expense of the other 90 per cent of the people of the United States.

That is all there is to this proposition. The purpose is not to help all the farmers but only those who produce these particular crops. Only about 24 per cent of our population is engaged in agricultural pursuits of all kinds. Of those so engaged the producers of these crops include only about one-third.

The effort to increase the prices of these crops, if it is successful, will increase the cost of living to every man, woman, and child in my district. If it is successful, it will increase the cost of living to every man, woman, and child in the whole United States. It will increase the cost of living not only to the 90 per cent who can receive no benefit from this measure but also to the 10 per cent who get the benefit of this measure. Farmers consume substantially one-third of their own products. This proposal is to increase the cost of that one-third as well as of the other two-thirds; to arbitrarily increase the farm value of the one-third of the products of the farm that is consumed by the farmer himself.

As the excuse for this iniquitous favoritism, for this confessed piece of class legislation, for this violation of every sound principle of economics, the pitiful plea is made: "Others have got it; let us get it for the farmers; others have special advantages given them by law. We must lift the farmer up to the level of those other classes that are receiving special advantages." No man has attempted to defend this measure from the standpoint of principle; it can not be so defended.

The only excuse and palliation for this measure is that it is an attempt to lift the farmer to the level of other groups who are the beneficiaries of class legislation and unjust Governmental favors.

I tell you, from knowledge gained between the plow handles and in every-day contact with rural life, that farmers as a class are not to be dealt with in the same way as many other classes. You can jack up a piece of timber because it has solidarity. You can jack up a stone, because it sticks together. But you can not jack up dirt and sand, because they have no adhesiveness. You can elevate the manufacturers of this country because they stick together in a sort of plunderbund which has as its cardinal principle that each will permit the other to stick his hand in his pocket without outcry if only he is permitted to thrust his own hand into the pocket of the general public. You can raise the bankers because their interests are in the main identical. You can raise certain other groups because they are organized and have class solidarity. But farmers in the nature of things can not be closely organized. Their interests are so complex, so varying, and on many points in actual conflict. You can not jack them up by any such means as this proposal.

THE HAUGEN BILL IS UNWORKABLE

The fundamental method of this and all similar agricultural relief methods is to benefit the growers of wheat, corn, cotton, and so forth, by stabilizing the farm sale price on a basis which will make production profitable. These measures are intended to establish a stable price varying little from year to year, and it is intended that this price shall be high enough to yield a reasonable profit to the producer.

The plan is in its essence unworkable and will break down in the end. Passing by all other objections, I point out that no line of agricultural production is free from doubts and uncertainties. Indeed, every occupation that man ever followed is surrounded by hazards which can not be avoided. If profits from wheat growing, and so forth, are made certain, farmers will leave other products and go to raising wheat. The present production of cotton is, say, 16,000,000 bales, but with an assured price of even 20 cents per pound production will be more than doubled within 10 years. More will be produced per acre, the acreage will be increased, men will work harder, and so on. If this bill should stabilize the growing of wheat, corn, and cotton on a certainly profitable basis, it would in time draw practically every farmer to growing those products. In the end, with the tremendous increase in production, it would be found impossible to hold the price up. The result would be collapse and ruin of all farmers and of agriculture generally. Bad as the farmer's condition is now, his second situation would be worse than his first.

HOW TO HELP THE FARMER

If you want to do something for the farmer, let me tell you so-called "friends of the farmer" two ways by which you can do it: Dissolve your unholy alliance with the great selfish in-

terests that are enjoying special favors. Do not delude the farmer longer by telling him that you can lift him to the level of those others who enjoy special privileges. It can not be done.

Dissolve that unholy alliance. Tell your constituents the truth. Tell the great intelligent rural population of the West and the South and other parts of this country the truth, that there is no way for a whole people to be benefited in any country or at any time except by a rigid adherence to that ancient Jeffersonian principle "Equal rights for all and special favors for none." [Applause.] Then take away these discriminatory laws. Strike them down. Tread them under foot. Let other classes and callings descend to the level with the farmer. Let every group stand or fall on its merits and on the social value of what it has to give. Let all use their talents and exercise their activities in open, free, and fair competition with the world. [Applause.] Let those who have not strength enough in their own legs to stand on that sound basis quit their occupations and go into some calling that an honest man can afford to follow. [Applause.]

Let me say another thing—I address the majority, because they have the power and the responsibility is theirs. Stop packing the Federal Trade Commission with the servants of the great exploiting interests who are despoiling the people. Stop packing the Interstate Commerce Commission with men whose greatest distinction is that they are satisfactory to the railroads. Stop filling the Federal bench with judges who have learned what they know as lawyers while fighting the battles of great corporations. Stop filling public offices with the servile tools of powerful, selfish interests. Put none but those who love and serve the common good in positions of responsibility.

WHY COTTON IS LOW, YET SHIRTS ARE HIGH

Do you know that the spread between what the producer receives and what the consumer pays has been more than doubled within the last 10 years? That is one of the great troubles of the farmer. He is suffering more from the high prices that he is forced to pay for what he buys than from the low prices for what he sells. The price of cotton is low, but the cost of shirts is high. The price of wheat is low, but the price of bread soars upon the wing. It is because ruthless extortion is practiced, and our Government either lacks the ability or the courage and the honesty to enforce the laws so that we may have fair trade practices.

Remedy these wrongs and then if you would have the Government to intervene in the situation let steps be taken to facilitate bringing the producers and consumers of this country face to face, thus eliminating the middlemen and unjust and unnecessary profits.

I hold that middlemen, where they contribute no service of value to the operation they carry on, are merely parasites. The man who has something to sell which he has produced in the sweat of his face is entitled to look into the eyes of the man who wants to consume it for himself. The producer should have the right to deal directly with the consumer. This is not always possible, but the Government might well take action to facilitate such intercourse. Men engaged in distribution frequently give services of value, but purely parasitic classes which stand between the producer and the consumer have no moral right to existence. They ought to be wiped out.

The Government can well do something which would facilitate the bringing together of the men who grow the wheat and the men who eat the bread—the producers generally and the consumers at large. Could that be done in a comprehensive way the profits of the farmer could be doubled and the cost to the consumer would be cut probably one-third.

It has been demonstrated as to many of the products which the people consume that the existing spread between the consumer and the producer is as three to one—that is to say, the consumer pays three times what the producer receives, and the other two-thirds go to middlemen and profit takers, who may perform no useful function in connection with the transaction.

Sound governmental policy, good common sense, and obedience to economic laws would dictate that our Government should do something to cut out this tremendous spread. If it could only be done, the farmer's return would be doubled and the reduction in cost to the consumer would be at least one-third. Of course, a world of people would be put out of business and would have to go to doing something else. I agree with that—they ought to be doing something else.

TOO MANY RIDING ON OTHER MEN'S SHOULDERS

Too large a percentage of the people in this country are riding upon somebody else's shoulders. Too few are engaged in the production of the necessities of life. Too few are engaged in doing the things that must be done to make human

existence possible in this world. Too many are following useless occupations; too many are merely burdens upon society. The strange thing about it all is that those who do useful labor, those who do the hard, dirty, and disagreeable tasks that are essential to human existence and to the preservation of society, always get the worst of it, while those who follow the least useful callings get the best of everything.

You can almost always tell to which of the classes a man belongs when you see him on the street or meet him on the highways. When you meet a man in a fine car and dressed in fine clothes you may know he does not belong to the producing class; that he is not a man who is necessary to the existence of society; that he may be merely a parasite riding on somebody's shoulders and of no social worth in all the world. But if you meet a man in overalls, whose hands are stained, who is rattling along in a rusty flivver, or perhaps, worse still—for it is worse—is walking, you can very safely say there is a man who is producing wheat or corn or beating hot iron or driving nails or doing something else which God Almighty intended man to do when He sent him into the world.

WEAVING A TANGLED WEB

Oh, go on with your systems of special legislation, your yielding to the demands of selfish groups, and your conferring of special favors. You Democrats who vote for this bill can never consistently vote against a protective tariff again. You will find this vote standing up in front of you and convicting you of insincerity. You can never hereafter stand on principle. Your future rule of action must be "How much is there in it for my district?"

You Republicans who vote for this bill can never again refuse to concede to any group of people whatever they may demand in the way of special favors. You have granted special favors to the manufacturers; you have done it for the railroads; you have done it for the banks. And now you are going to do it for a class of farmers, those who produce only about one-third in value of the total agricultural production.

Along will come the other two-thirds of the farmers. They produce poultry or dairy products—they are truckers, raisers of sheep and cattle, or grow many other useful products. Theirs constitutes two-thirds of the total agricultural production of the United States. They come and say, "We also are in distress; do something for us." You reply, "Oh, you have a domestic market; we can not do anything for you." They will say, "Yes, you can; you must give us a subsidy out of the Federal Treasury." And I want to tell you that in logic and good conscience you who vote for this measure can not honestly refuse to give what they ask.

Then when you have taken care of all the farmers what about the millions of unclassified people? What about the professional classes? What about millions who have no regular occupations? What about those in distress and in need in every walk of life who are not included among these classes you have favored? When they come, what will you say to them? You may say, "We can not help you with a Haugen bill; we can not help you by a protective tariff; we can not help you with this, that, or the other systems through which we have granted special favors, and so we can not help you at all." "Oh, yes," they can say; "you can; you can give us pensions; put us on the Federal pay roll; you owe us as much the duty to do something for us as you did anybody else."

That will be true, and you who vote for this grant of special favor and refuse to vote for old-age pensions and out-of-work doles or even for cold gifts to the needy will convict yourselves of simply doing this out of political fear and not out of conviction. [Applause.]

As for the farmer, I hold to the deep conviction that the only way to remedy his ills is by securing for him "a fair field and no favor." If he can get that, he will take care of himself; give him that and he will be content. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, if there is no further demand for time to support my argument, I will show my generosity by yielding three minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FORT].

Mr. FORT. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for time from the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LUCE] because it seems to me improper that this debate should close without a statement from those of us on the Committee on Agriculture, who are opposed to the Haugen bill, of our very firm belief that Congress can and should pass remedial legislation for agriculture.

The question that this House is to consider, under the rule, is, strictly speaking, a single proposal known as the Haugen bill. It seems to me unfortunate that under the form of the rule it is the only bill which is specifically up for discussion.

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] has asked of the House to-day that opportunity be given for a vote upon his bill. Personally, I believe the House will be recreant in its duty to this great problem if it does not permit itself to have the opportunity to go on record on all projected proposals for farm relief. The problem exists. The problem is real. The problem is one for which we, as Members of Congress, are charged with the duty to find a solution.

I do not believe with the advocates of the Haugen bill—perhaps not in what they say on the floor, but in what they say back home—that it is possible for us to go to the length and the limit that that bill is told to the people back home as going.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. FORT. May I have two minutes more?

Mr. LUCE. I yield two minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. FORT. I do not believe it is possible for this Congress by legislation to accomplish what the proponents of the Haugen bill claim at home it will accomplish; but if we concede that there is a problem, then we are very delinquent in the performance of our duties if, having made the diagnosis that the problem exists and having made a diagnosis of the causes of the problem—which any man on this floor can make if he will study—we sit back supinely and refuse to apply all the brains in this House to its solution. There is a problem and where there is a problem you and I and every other Member owes it to himself and to the Nation as a whole, producer and consumer alike, to think, to study, and to vote along those lines which, so far as in our judgment the Government of the United States can go within its constitutional limitations, offer relief for that problem. Therefore I hope the House will join in the motion of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP], and I hope we will throw wide open this discussion and the subsequent action of the House in order that we may make every possible effort, in the performance of our sworn duty, to relieve the condition of agriculture. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has again expired.

Mr. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, with the high regard that Massachusetts has always entertained for Virginia, it gives me pleasure to yield 12 minutes to the gentleman from that Commonwealth [Mr. DEAL]. [Applause.]

Mr. DEAL. Mr. Speaker, I shall oppose all of the bills now under consideration by the House proposing relief for our agricultural interests. I am a farmer myself, the greater part of my life savings being invested in farm lands and agriculture. I produce four of the so-called basic products mentioned in these bills for price fixing and stabilization. It would seem, therefore, that my personal interest would prompt me to support these measures.

I am not here to promote my personal interest, pecuniary or political, but to represent the best interests, with the lights before me, of the people in my district, of the State of Virginia, and finally to uphold and support the Constitution of the United States.

My best judgment is that the proposed legislation is economically unsound and will not result in the great advantages which its proponents seem to think will accrue to the agricultural interests of our country. Not only do I believe it to be unsound, but it is wholly unconstitutional and antagonistic to the principles upon which our Government is founded.

During the Cleveland administration Congress authorized an appropriation with which to purchase seeds for the farmers of a certain drought-stricken area in the State of Texas. This bill was promptly vetoed by the President, with the statement that he could find no warrant in the Constitution justifying the Government in taking money from one class of citizens and giving it to another.

All of these bills proposing farm relief indicate a strained effort by a camouflage of words and phrases and language to get around a plain inhibition of the Constitution. The only purpose for which Congress is permitted to levy and collect taxes is to pay the debts and for the common defense and general welfare of the United States. These bills propose to take \$250,000,000 of the taxpayers' money to be used in the interest of a particular class. Certainly it can not be charged that the Government is in debt to the farmers for any value received, direct or indirect. We do not owe them as a class or as individuals anything that we do not owe to every other American citizen. It is not a matter of common defense, in that the farmers are producing a surplus which must be sold on foreign markets; nor can it be construed as for the general welfare, in that it places an increased burden of indirect taxation upon 72 per cent of the consuming public, who would receive no benefit

therefrom, in order to promote the interest of 28 per cent. There is absolutely no warrant in the Constitution, so far as I have been able to determine, for that which is clearly class legislation.

It may not be improper that I call attention to a decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of *Craig v. Missouri* (U. S. 29, 408), in which no less a person than Chief Justice Marshall, speaking for the court, said, among other things, that the Constitution is not to be evaded by giving new names to old things, and that is just what we are attempting to do in the matter of this legislation.

But I shall not attempt to further discuss this feature. Others more able than I have and will present it. I shall content myself with referring to certain other phases, because I can not help feeling a resentment at a proposal that may add to the burdens of the consumers of my district more than a million dollars annually of indirect taxes, which it is proposed to put into the pockets of a class of people in other communities.

It might be well for the proponents of this legislation to consider that unjust and unwise taxation started the Roman Empire upon its decline, and that taxation of one class and exemption of another during the eighteenth century brought on the French Revolution, resulting in thousands of those who had been beneficiaries of the system being led to the guillotine, and precipitated wars lasting through nearly a century. There is nothing which so enrages a people as unjust and inequitable taxation.

It is not my desire to be discourteous to or impugn the motives of any of my colleagues upon this floor, but when the interest of those whom I represent is so vitally infringed I am constrained to remind my colleagues that these proposals for farm relief had their origin in the far Northwest among those who have received the greatest benefits from the Federal Government. Their first attempt was a price-fixing scheme upon wheat, corn, hogs, and cattle, the principal commodity products of this section of the country. Failing in this, cotton and dairy products were added in an attempt to secure votes. Failing again, tobacco and rice have now been added, and I believe in one proposal it is contemplated to cover the whole field of agriculture, but always wheat has been advanced most persistently in the price-fixing scheme.

The argument advanced as an excuse for this legislation is that the Government has protected and aided the bankers, manufacturers, transportation, and labor. My answer is that the Government has not done a thing in aid of the banker, the manufacturer, transportation, or labor that it has not done for the farmer, and in addition thereto much legislation has been enacted in the interest of the farmer that has not been accorded to any other interest. Indeed, there has been no legislation in aid of the banking interest. The Federal reserve bank was created in the interest of all of the people of this country in order that certain concentrated capital of the larger banks of the country might be prevented from withdrawing credits and depressing values for speculative purposes and then easing credits and boosting prices that they might realize.

The banking interests in the country as a whole were antagonistic to the Federal reserve system. Our laws inhibit the banking interests from charging usurious rates. The Government has never prohibited the farmer from charging any price that he might desire for his products. It has prohibited the railroads from combining and fixing freight rates in the interest of the general public and of the farmer in particular. It has, it is true, provided for duties on imports, a specific grant by the Constitution, of which many manufacturers have taken advantage and profited, but it has done the same for the farmer. It has enacted an antitrust law to prevent combinations of capital from fixing prices to the detriment of the consumer, but the farmer has been favored with an exemption as to its provisions. We have exempted labor organizations from the provisions of the Sherman Antitrust Law and have permitted them to combine in restraint of trade, but we have done the same for agriculture. If agriculture has failed to take advantage of the exemptions and protections afforded by the Government, it is due to the large number of small capitalists and noncapitalists engaged in that industry which has made it impossible to bring about a coordination of effort.

I was for many years a member of an organization of lumbermen controlling individually far more capital than is usually invested by the average farmer. Our members were relatively few as compared with the agricultural interest, and yet through a period of 40 years these organizations have never been able to bring together their membership in anything like a coordinate effort at limiting production or price fixing. It has been simply impossible; and if this be true with respect to a small number of larger capitalists, it is utterly out of the question to expect

the farmers to be able to form a combination for restriction of output and the fixing of prices.

Permit me to point to some of the things that the Government has done in its effort to aid and improve agricultural conditions.

Our public lands have been opened up to the homesteader, thus giving the farmer, especially in the Northwest, a working capital, which has been accorded to no other class of citizens. He has demanded and received loans from the Government upon his lands at low rates of interest. He has demanded and received credit upon his products pending marketing. Money has been placed in a revolving fund to finance marketing agencies. Government irrigation plants have been constructed for his benefit. Lumber, more than 30 years ago, was placed on the free list to aid him in building cheaper homes. Duties have been removed from agricultural implements in his interest. Money on more than one occasion has been loaned with which to purchase seed, and which in large measure has not been repaid. In 1921 \$2,000,000 were appropriated for this purpose and in 1922 \$1,500,000. Of these amounts only 71.6 per cent have been repaid. Duties have been placed upon imports of competitive wheat and corn for his benefit. We have spent, and are still spending, millions of dollars in waterway development to aid him in cheaper transportation.

With all of this favoritism, pampering, and paternalism, not accorded to any other class of citizens, he has come to feel that he should be denied nothing, not even a subsidy to take care of his losses as a result of improvidence and extravagance.

Nothing is great or small, rich or poor, except by comparison. Without intending to reflect upon the people of any State or wound the sensibilities of those who represent them, I will point to seven States that produce one-third of all the wheat grown in the Union, namely, Idaho, Montana, North and South Dakota, Iowa, Nebraska, and Minnesota, and compare them with seven of our Southern States, from one of which I am here as a Representative, as an indication of public extravagance which might have something to do with the claim of depression and bankruptcy, namely, Virginia, North and South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, and Mississippi.

The population of the seven Western States is 8,350,410; of the seven Southern States 14,555,131. In 1922 the aggregate public debt, including the subdivisions, of these Western States was \$737,579,492, as compared with \$636,077,938 for the seven Southern States. The revenues for State and subdivisions of the Western States aggregated \$431,308,140, as against \$272,201,041 for the Southern States. The farm-mortgage debt of the seven Western States is \$1,100,000,000, estimated by the Bureau of the Census, was \$2,778,322,000, as compared with \$406,560,000. The number of automobiles in the aggregate of the seven Western States was one to 4.9 persons, as against one for 10.6 persons in the seven Southern States. The assessed values of the seven Western States was \$11,559,677,868, as against \$8,470,052,194.

The amount of revenue paid for the support of the Federal Government in the seven Western States was \$67,911,191.93, or 2.4 per cent of the Federal revenues, as against \$231,404,202.13, or 8.8 per cent of the entire Federal revenues.

The population of the United States at the last census was approximately 105,000,000 people, 30,000,000, or 28 per cent, of whom are engaged in agriculture, but of those who are thus engaged it is probable that under half are producing the basic products mentioned in these bills. Is it possible that a majority of the Members of this House are willing to tax indirectly 90,000,000 of the consumers for the necessities of life in the interests of the remaining 15,000,000, using the strong arm of the law to force surrender of their hard-earned savings, which will cheapen the cost of living for Europeans, in order that 15,000,000 of our people may produce a surplus at a profit? How can we go before our people and say that we have placed a bread tax of \$600,000,000 annually upon the consumer, plus a meat tax, a tobacco tax, and a clothing tax, which will place an annual burden of a billion and a half dollars upon the consuming public if the result of these bills will be as claimed by its proponents?

These are staggering figures and indicate that the entire pecuniary distress of the northwest farmer is due, not so much to the low price of wheat as to the extravagance of their people in taxes laid, money borrowed by the States and subdivisions, farm mortgages, and in the luxury of the automobile. I do not object to every person in each of the States enjoying the luxury of an automobile or any other luxury, provided that you do not take from my State—the people of which can afford only 1 automobile for every 10½ persons—the money to support this luxury. Whenever we spend more money than we have; financial distress is inevitable.

There may be other grounds, however, for the intense agitation for this legislation. Judging from the letters I have re-

ceived from the western country, I should say that the bankers are even more interested than the farmers. It seems that they have departed from the ways of conservatism and reasonable banking methods as laid down by the experience of ages. The money of their stockholders has evidently been loaned upon insufficient security. These obligations, owing to heavy taxes, automobiles, and other causes, have become frozen, and now the bankers are confronted with failure or help from some source to overcome the results of mismanagement, and are no doubt using the farmer to pull their chestnuts out of the fire.

The proposed legislation is objectionable in that it involves the Government in a high-flying, kiting business adventure, the end and results of which no person can foresee. It creates an additional bureau with all of the expense incident thereto—a new building, perhaps, with an army of clerks and janitors, and heat and lights and water. Its life is intended to be perpetual, a veritable barnacle upon the ship of state to slow down its progress, and eventually aid in its destruction. It would be better far, in my humble opinion, that the Government should pay a direct subsidy to the farmers of this country, through agencies already established, upon warehouse or railroad receipts, rather than to establish the expensive bureau proposed, and thus create an additional and perpetual lobby, paid by the Government, with the use of Government printing offices and the franking privilege, to circularize the agricultural industry in an effort to brow-beat and drive our Representatives in a continued appropriation of the taxpayers' money to float an uneconomical, unscientific, and wasteful business operation.

Granting, for the sake of argument, that the policy of our Government has resulted in class advantage in other lines of endeavor, it can scarcely be conceded that two wrongs make a right. Let us correct the suggested existing evils, placing all of our people upon the same plane, and holding open the door of opportunity for all alike. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has three minutes remaining.

Mr. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, I will conclude this aspect of the case by summing up the reasons why a large number of men in this country, who would like to help agriculture, are unable to support the McNary-Haugen bill or the Aswell bill, but will accept the Crisp bill if it can be modified to accomplish the purposes that we have in mind.

The chief of these purposes is to lessen the cause of the evil of overproduction. We protest against the Haugen bill because it will increase the cost of living to the American consumer, while it will lessen the cost of living to his foreign competitor; because it will bring into cultivation more acreage, and thus in a vicious circle pile up trouble until the system itself collapses.

We object to it because in the working details of the system it will bring hardship to a great many farmers who are not within the scope of its hoped-for benefits. They will be harassed and vexed by attempting to conform to the minutiae of a system which they do not understand and which can bring them no good. Yet, I think I speak the views of many men from the East when I say that we will support any measure which will give the farmer fair play and at the same time work justice to all the people.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, I understand the gentleman from North Carolina desires to reserve, for the present, the use of his 10 minutes. I understand, also, that the yielding to other speakers will not deprive me of the control of the time and the floor. With that understanding, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have the honor of being a member of both the Committee on Agriculture that reported this bill to the House and also of the Committee on Rules that has brought in the rule for its present consideration. In the brief time that I have I will explain somewhat the motives that actuated the members of the two committees responsible for the bill and the pending rule.

When this matter was being considered last year the gentleman from New York [Mr. JACOBSTEIN] presented to the House a series of charts prepared by the Bureau of Economics in the Department of Agriculture showing the relative trend of prices for the period from 1910 to 1914 before the war and from 1919 to 1925, as to the ratio of prices existing between agricultural and nonagricultural products. Gentlemen will remember the sensation which was created by the sad plight of agriculture as shown by the gentleman from New York in his charts at that time. It was shown by these charts that the farmers of the United States from the period from 1919 to 1925 had received \$13,000,000,000 less for their products than they would have received had the ratio price between agricultural and nonagricultural products obtained during that time that obtained during the four-year period preceding the war.

No one will undertake to say that the price of agricultural products as compared with nonagricultural products was excessive during the four-year period prior to the war. No one, as far as I know, has questioned or contradicted the absolute accuracy of the charts shown by the gentleman from New York. I submit to you, gentlemen of the House, that the facts shown by the gentleman from New York were astounding. They account for the great unrest throughout the agricultural sections of the country and the almost universal distress of the farmers producing the basic agricultural products of America.

Now, that simply means this: That the farmers of the country from 1919 to 1925, inclusive, received \$13,000,000,000 less for the products of their toil than they were entitled to receive under an equitable distribution of the creation of new wealth. That situation should not be permitted to continue in this country if it is possible by legislation in any proper way to rectify or cure it. I think we all agree to that. Both of the great political parties in this country in 1924 wrote into their platform promises of the most solemn character to the farmers of the United States for remedial legislation. The Republican platform adopted in Cleveland referred to the distressed condition of agriculture and to the great hardships imposed upon agriculture, and promised the farmers of this country that if given a vote of confidence at the polls the Republican Party would enact legislation placing agriculture upon an equality with other industries.

Mr. Speaker, we have now reached the middle of the administration that was called to power by the American people, making its appeal for support on that platform. That plank in the Republican platform is yet unredeemed.

The Committee on Agriculture of the House for more than three years has been giving most careful consideration to this perplexing problem, and it is a great problem. We have heard in that time representatives and spokesmen of every responsible farm organization in the United States. We have had men before our committee from almost every State in the Union. We have had the editors of the great farm journals of the country; we have had the presidents of the agricultural colleges; we have had experts and economists who have given study to this question. Many plans have been suggested to the committee in that time; but I say to you that out of all the plans submitted, all the theories advanced, all the bills introduced to solve this great problem, there has been but one measure that to any degree commanded the support of organized agriculture in America, and that is the McNary-Haugen bill. [Applause.] It may not be a perfect piece of legislation; it may be that it will have to be amended; it may not give the relief that its proponents hope it will, but after years of thought and study it is the one measure presented to the Committee on Agriculture that the farm organizations in the United States join in saying meets their approval and to which they have given their support. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LUCE], who is opposed to all special privilege, said that it might be that the Crisp bill could be amended so that it would meet his support. I say to the gentleman from Massachusetts now that so far as I know, and I have been a member of this great committee for six years, not a single national farm organization in the United States to-day is for the Crisp bill. Every one is against it. They have repudiated it, and they say they would rather have no legislation than have the Crisp bill. It is not further extension of credit that they want, and if I am wrong in that statement I shall be glad to be corrected. So far as I know, not a single representative farmer of this country who has given intelligent consideration to these problems is giving his support to the principles in the Crisp bill. What could the Committee on Agriculture do? It reported out finally, by a majority vote, the measure that has the support of the great agricultural organizations, in the main if not all of them, that was indorsed by the American Federation of Labor, that has the indorsement of the bankers' associations of many States—a measure that the legislatures of 8 or 10 of the great States of the Union have memorialized Congress to enact into law. We now present this measure to the House for consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes more to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, then the matter came before the Rules Committee, of which, as I said, I am also a member. What was the attitude of the Rules Committee? It was manifestly the duty of that committee to make possible the consideration of this legislation and the solution of this problem in the House, and that is what the committee did. The rule presented for your consideration and approval

is not a gag rule; it simply makes in order the consideration of this bill and offers unlimited opportunities for amendment, for the substitution of any germane proposition to any section of the bill or to the whole bill. It is the usual, ordinary rule that is brought into this House by the Rules Committee making in order for consideration the work of any of the committees of the House. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP]—and I yield to no one on the floor of this House in my respect and admiration for him—has asked the House to do the unusual thing of voting down the previous question and refusing the consideration of this measure until the rule is amended giving him an opportunity to offer his bill that has not the support of a single national farm organization in the United States, on a motion to recommit. We have other measures before our committee. There is one great farm organization of this country that has not joined with the other farm organizations in support of the Haugen bill. Their representative said that they were not fighting any particular bill, but they approved another bill, and that is the Grange, the head of which lives in the State of the gentleman now presiding, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BEGG]. That bill is before the committee, the debenture plan. A good many Members are in favor of that. Some members of the Committee on Agriculture favor it. But where will we stop if we depart from the usual practice of the House and give the gentleman from Georgia an opportunity to present a proposition here that is not in order under the general rules of the House? Will we say that the other propositions shall not be presented, but the one advocated by the gentleman from Georgia will be given this exceptional status? When other committees in the House report on matters of importance in the future, we will have the precedent of allowing everybody who has a proposition of any kind to come in and have it submitted to the House through a motion to recommit. Our duty here, in my judgment, is plain. Agriculture is in distress. The condition is more acute to-day than on the day Mr. JACOBSTEIN submitted those charts to which I have referred. We were all elected on platforms pledging our constituents that we would enact adequate farm legislation. We may differ as to what plan is best, but it is the duty of this House to give consideration to the measure that has been reported out by the Committee on Agriculture and then to vote it either up or down and let the people know whether the Representatives of the great Democratic and Republican Parties in this Chamber will keep faith with the people and redeem the solemn promises written into the platforms on which they were elected. [Applause.]

I am glad to say in this connection and in closing that every Member of Congress from the great State of Illinois, and it is a great agricultural State and a great industrial State, outside of the city of Chicago, both Democrats and Republicans, are voting unitedly to redeem the promises made in the respective platforms of our parties and to enact into law the legislation that has the indorsement of practically all the great farm organizations of the country. [Applause.]

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield seven minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BRAND].

Mr. BRAND of Ohio. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I rise because my name was included in the remarks of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BEGG] this morning. He stated that I had taken part in a debate at Dayton, Ohio, at the State meeting of the grange. This is the first information that I have had that I was in a debate. I was asked by the master of the grange in Ohio in September to explain the McNary-Haugen bill at the State meeting, and two months after that the National Grange met and considered farm legislation and came to a conclusion, and I want to read that conclusion of the National Grange:

Whereas our staple agricultural products are in world-wide competition with like products in other lands; and

Whereas such surplus products are not receiving the benefits of the protective tariff: Be it

Resolved, That the National Grange indorse an export debenture plan for farm products and recommend that legislation be enacted by the next session of Congress, making such plan operative beginning with the 1927 crop.

Now, I am greatly obliged to the gentleman from Ohio for this opportunity to make the House acquainted with the fact that the grange has acted in favor of a bill almost identical with the McNary-Haugen bill. [Applause.] Last year it did not have any support from the grange, none whatever. They did not seem to know what they thought, but now they acknowledge that agriculture is in a state of depression, that by the efforts of the farmers alone they can not come out of that depression, that it will require national legislation, and they also say the tariff is not effective upon surplus products.

Now that is almost all anybody can say as an advocate of the McNary-Haugen bill. I went before that grange and I never said a word against the debenture plan, not a word, so there could have been no debate on my part. It is true a man who followed me explained rather hysterically the difference between the McNary-Haugen bill and the debenture plan, after which I left for another meeting. Now about the Ohio Farm Bureau. I think it is fair to explain to the House the action of the Ohio Farm Bureau. We have a week at the Ohio State University every year which we call "Farmers' week," and during that week there are delegates selected by the Farm Bureau in each county to go to the meeting at Columbus. Monday and Tuesday of that week these delegates met and discussed this and that, and attended to business, but they left the resolutions until Tuesday night, engineered no doubt by some of the leaders. And what was that meeting Tuesday night? Why, it was a meeting of the Chamber of Commerce of Columbus, Ohio, giving a banquet at the Neal House, and I presume it is fair to say that the Chamber of Commerce of Columbus is probably following the Chamber of Commerce of the United States in trying to kill this farm legislation. Now they had those delegates there at that meeting, and after a good meal and banquet they ushered Mr. Jardine, United States Secretary of Agriculture, upon the platform and he spent some time in opposition to the McNary-Haugen bill. Then to cap the climax they had there Professor Jordan, who represented the Industrial Board of New York, the industries of the United States, to make the other speech, and then at the conclusion of this banquet and immediately following it, without anybody explaining and defending the McNary-Haugen bill, they asked those delegates to vote, and they did, probably overawed by the atmosphere around them. Now, gentlemen of the House, the next morning after the conclusion of farmers' week in Ohio, the papers came out and said this. Here are the headlines in a Columbus paper:

Farmers confident relief coming soon. Visitors returning home to-night expect to see legislation in operation.

Now that is really what the farmers of Ohio are expecting of this Congress.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, I would be glad if the gentleman from Tennessee would use his 10 minutes.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, just at this time I shall confine my remarks to the rule itself. At a later date I hope opportunity will be afforded me to discuss the bills for a few moments.

I wish now to speak of the rule itself and of the attitude of the Committee on Rules toward it in view of the remarks and the appeal made by my friend from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] for a double motion to recommit, and in view of the remarks made by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FORT], in which he said that he thought the House would be recreant to its duty if it failed to vote down the previous question so that it could be amended to provide for the double recommitment motion.

I have no personal feeling concerning this matter at all. All that I desire is that the House shall understand thoroughly the attitude of the Committee on Rules. Your Committee on Rules has reported here simply the usual, ordinary rule which admits, because it must admit, a motion to recommit which contains germane matter.

Reference has been made to the fact that at the last session of Congress a very extraordinary rule was presented for consideration of agricultural legislation. That is true. We were confronted by a very extraordinary condition. There was a general desire to consider the subject matter of agricultural legislation, but the Committee on Agriculture found itself unable to agree by a majority upon any particular bill, and so that committee technically reported, without their having a recommendation of the majority, three bills to the House. And so the Committee on Rules was confronted by that extraordinary situation, and the committee brought in the only unusual rule that I recall having been brought in during my term of service on the Committee on Rules. But that rule did not provide for two motions to recommit. The Committee on Rules took the Haugen bill as the basis, and it, in the rule, did make two bills in the alternative in order to be offered without reference to the question of germaneness. The rest of the rule was just as is provided in the resolution now before us.

In this case the Committee on Rules was not confronted by the question of germaneness. The official parliamentarian of the House—and I violate no confidence in saying that—and many Members also who have given minute study to parliamentary law went into the situation and decided that both the Aswell bill and the Tinchler bill were germane; and so there was no such question of germaneness as we had to deal with

at the last session of Congress. Therefore, the Committee on Rules brought in this special resolution in the usual form.

The high privilege of a motion to recommit, let me say to the House, was not always made mandatory by the rules of the House. Up until March 15, 1909, it was always possible for the Committee on Rules to bring in a rule which would prevent the motion to recommit; any motion to recommit; and if that rule were adopted, the House was shut off. But in the very famous rules revolution here in March, 1909, under the leadership of the gentleman from New York [Mr. Fitzgerald] there was inserted in the rule a provision that the Committee on Rules could not bring in a resolution which would take away the opportunity of offering one motion to recommit. The reason for it was to give the minority one opportunity to express itself upon a substantive proposition which it wished to offer as a substitution for the action of the majority.

It is very hard, very embarrassing, to refuse any request made by the gentleman from Georgia because of his delightful personality, his great ability, his character, and the respect in which he is held by the House. But I do not think that the gentleman from Georgia has been deprived of any parliamentary right of any particular value here. If this rule should be adopted his proposition is germane. When the Aswell proposition shall be offered as a substitute for the Haugen bill it will be immediately in order—that is in Committee of the Whole—to offer the Crisp proposition as a substitute for the Aswell proposition, or if the Aswell proposition be voted down, then the Crisp proposal will be in order. Its further parliamentary status will then depend upon the action of the Committee of the Whole. All the rights of the gentleman in the Committee of the Whole are preserved fully under the general rules of the House. In the House itself, if the Crisp proposal fails in committee, the House by voting down the previous question on the Aswell motion to recommit, can if it chooses, substitute the Crisp proposal.

All I wish the House to know is that the Committee on Rules, notwithstanding its high regard for the gentleman from Georgia, felt that it ought not to set a precedent which might arise to plague us a hundred times in the future, and bring in a double-barreled motion to recommit. It is not practicable to include all the propositions that gentleman would like to have opportunity to offer. I know three or four propositions for which I would like to vote here.

That is the attitude of the Committee on Rules. There is nothing personal in regard to this matter; I am making no personal appeal. I am simply saying to you that the Committee on Rules acted in accordance with precedent, and moved along the usual lines in the consideration of this resolution.

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

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Certainly.

Mr. CRISP. I do not know whether the gentleman would feel at liberty to answer this question. If he does not he need not answer. Is it not a fact that the Committee on Rules by a vote of 6 to 5 refused to grant my motion to recommit?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I do not feel at liberty under the rules to state what transpired in the committee. The gentleman has been informed, I am sure, of what occurred.

Mr. CRISP. That is my information.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. There was a vote in the committee on the gentleman's proposition, and the majority of the committee moved along the line of ordinary procedure and did not grant the extraordinary request of the gentleman from Georgia.

That, Mr. Speaker, I believe is all I care to say about it. I wish to reiterate the statement that I have no personal feeling whatever in the matter. We have simply acted in an orderly way on an important matter of legislation.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. JONES. Did the Committee on Rules consider a motion to recommit having in view the debenture plan? Because if the motion for the previous question is voted down I wish to have the privilege of offering that motion.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. The committee did not consider that proposition. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. McKeown] has a bill pending now which some day will be discussed with considerable care, I believe. It was not considered nor were others.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. What was the real objection to providing for two motions to recommit in the rule, if two motions would permit an intelligent judgment on the part of the House?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Well, if you have two you might have to include three or more, in order to give all the chance to express judgment, so far as expressing it on a roll call be concerned. The proposition of assuring in the rules a motion to recommit was inserted largely to protect political rights; that is, to insure the right of a political minority to an expression of its views. Certainly there is no division here along party lines over this question. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, as I understand, I have 13 minutes remaining. I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. RAMSEYER].

Mr. RAMSEYER. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I shall not undertake to discuss and had not intended to discuss the merits of the farm relief legislation to-day. I had intended to say something about the rule. I did not know the gentleman from Tennessee was going to speak or that he was going to discuss the rule. I had intended and do now intend to say something along the line the gentleman emphasized in his usual able and lucid way as to why the Committee on Rules reported out this kind of rule and to call your attention to the difference between the situation now and the situation which existed last May when the McNary-Haugen bill was then before the House of Representatives. In that rule we made it in order to offer two other bills as substitutes in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union. The bills had been reported out by the Committee on Agriculture and what the Rules Committee did, it did so at the request of the Committee on Agriculture. The rule did not provide for more than one motion to recommit. Never since this rule for a motion to recommit has been in existence, so far as I know, and I am sure never since I have been a Member of the House of Representatives, has there been a proposal for two motions to recommit in a special rule, as the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] has requested and his request is reinforced by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FORT]. I have a very high regard for both of these gentlemen, but that is no reason why I or any other Member of this House should accede to this unusual request.

The gentleman from Georgia makes an appeal to the House and says, "Do you not want to give us a fair chance?" Now, has he not had a fair chance? His bill has had the same chance as any bill that has been introduced in this session or any other session. He drops his bill in the hopper; it goes to the proper committee; it is considered by the proper committee, and his bill, like most bills, was not reported out. The Committee on Agriculture saw fit this session to report out one bill known as the Haugen bill. That is the only bill on farm relief reported out at this session by that committee.

Now, as has been well said, if the proposal of Mr. CRISP should have special consideration there is no reason under the sun why three or four other proposals should not have like consideration.

The proposal of Mr. CRISP not only does not have the committee's indorsement but, as stated by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. WILLIAMS], it does not have the indorsement of a single farm organization in the United States. There is one proposal that was before the Committee on Agriculture, to wit, the bill introduced by Mr. ADKINS, which has the indorsement of a large and influential national farm organization, and certainly if we make two motions to recommit in order, one of which for the special accommodation of the gentleman from Georgia, we ought to make three or four motions in order so as to accommodate all the fellows who have bills which they regard for the relief of agriculture. [Applause.]

Mr. CRISP. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSEYER. With pleasure.

Mr. CRISP. In the interest of accuracy, I desire to state that the Georgia Farm Union and the Georgia Cooperative Cotton Association have both indorsed my bill, and I may say further, I did not understand that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ADKINS], who introduced the debenture bill, urged it; but, on the contrary, in his own committee voted against it in favor of the Haugen bill.

Mr. RAMSEYER. That is true; but the Adkins bill has the indorsement of a national farm organization. I am glad the gentleman from Georgia has some support. I accepted as correct the statement made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. WILLIAMS], who is on the Committee on Agriculture, and before which committee indorsements of the various bills are on file. There is no national farm organization supporting the Crisp bill, although there may be some local organizations supporting it.

Mr. HILL of Maryland. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSEYER. Yes.

Mr. HILL of Maryland. Is the Adkins bill the one indorsed by the grange?

Mr. RAMSEYER. I am so advised.

Mr. ADKINS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSEYER. Yes.

Mr. ADKINS. I voted not to report my bill out because I thought it was in about the same boat with Mr. CRISP's bill, that it had no chance to pass; that if we got any legislation it would be through the Haugen bill, and I did not want to stand in the way of not getting legislation. [Applause.]

Mr. RAMSEYER. I simply want to say in closing that as soon as I yield the floor, or very soon thereafter, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] will move the previous question. Ordinarily when a rule like this is presented the previous question is moved before debate, thus limiting debate to 40 minutes on the rule, or if there is an extension of time desired the gentleman who calls up the resolution for a rule asks that a certain length of time be given for debate, and at the end of which time the previous question be considered as ordered. This was not done to-day, but the gentleman from Ohio assured us that the previous question would be moved by him. It will be moved and if carried, as it ought to be carried in this case, then, of course, the next question will be on the adoption of the rule. There is no serious opposition to this rule. Everyone here, whether he be for this plan or that plan, or for any plan, is in favor of considering this agricultural relief legislation.

Mr. BURTNESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSEYER. For a question.

Mr. BURTNESS. The gentleman suggests that Mr. CRISP has had his opportunity in the past with reference to his bill. Is it not also true that he will have his opportunity under this rule by being privileged to present his bill as an amendment to the Haugen bill when the reading of the bill is reached in the Committee of the Whole and get a vote on it there?

Mr. RAMSEYER. There is no question about that and, as has been stated, the parliamentary clerk gives it as his opinion that the Crisp bill is germane to the Haugen bill. I have compared the bills; and while I do not claim to be an expert, I incline to the opinion that the Crisp bill, as well as the Aswell bill, will be held germane to the Haugen bill. So each of these bills will have a run for its money. The two bills will have every chance in the world under the general rules of the House. These bills, if germane, not only can be offered as substitutes, but they can be offered section by section to the Haugen bill during the reading under the five-minute rule. If the Haugen bill survives the ordeal to which it will be subjected in the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, the opponents of the Haugen bill then have an opportunity to offer any germane motion to recommit.

Under the rule the opponents of the Haugen bill, including the gentleman from Georgia, have the same fair chance that opponents of proposed legislation have always had heretofore under the general rules of the House.

Mr. HILL of Maryland. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. RAMSEYER. If it is on the rule.

Mr. HILL of Maryland. Does the gentleman consider that the provisions of the Adkins bill would be germane and could be offered?

Mr. RAMSEYER. That is not a question on the rule. I have not studied the Adkins bill with that question in mind.

The proposed rule is such a rule as we have reported time and again, and the Committee on Rules, which reported out this rule, asks that the House, for the sake of orderly procedure in the future, sustain the committee by adopting the rule we have reported here. The House, by its action to-day, should not grant a request that it would not be ready and willing to grant to other gentlemen in the future. The rule before you now is in the usual form. All it does it makes the consideration of the farm relief bill reported out by the Committee on Agriculture in order. It can not be so considered without the rule. You will do the fair and sensible thing if you vote for the previous question and then adopt the rule. [Applause.]

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

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time and move the previous question.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CRISP) there were—yeas 145, nays 98.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 217, nays 147, not voting 69, as follows:

(Roll No. 26)

YEAS—217

- | | | | |
|-----------------|-------------------|-------------------|----------------|
| Adkins | Dominick | Kendall | Rayburn |
| Allen | Dowell | Kiefner | Reece |
| Andresen | Driver | Kincheloe | Reid, Ill. |
| Arentz | Dyer | Knutson | Robinson, Iowa |
| Arnold | Elliott | Kopp | Robison, Ky. |
| Aswell | Englebright | Kunz | Romjue |
| Auf der Heide | Esllick | Kvale | Rowbottom |
| Ayres | Esterly | Lanham | Rubey |
| Bachmann | Evans | Lazaro | Sabath |
| Bailey | Faust | Lea, Calif. | Sanders, Tex. |
| Bankhead | Fisher | Leatherwood | Schnedder |
| Barbour | Fitzgerald, W. T. | Leavitt | Sears, Nebr. |
| Barkley | Frear | Letts | Shallenberger |
| Beck | French | Lindsay | Simmons |
| Beers | Fulmer | Lineberger | Sinclair |
| Black, N. Y. | Funk | Little | Snott |
| Black, Tex. | Furlow | Lowrey | Smith |
| Bloom | Garber | Lozier | Somers, N. Y. |
| Boies | Gardner, Ind. | Lyon | Speaks |
| Bowman | Garrett, Tenn. | McFadden | Sproul, Kans. |
| Box | Garrett, Tex. | McLaughlin, Nebr. | Staker |
| Boylan | Gasque | McLeod | Strong, Kans. |
| Brand, Ohio | Goodwin | McReynolds | Summers, Wash. |
| Briggs | Green, Fla. | Magrady | Swank |
| Browne | Green, Iowa | Major | Swartz |
| Browning | Greenwood | Mansfield | Swing |
| Brumm | Griest | Martin, La. | Thomas |
| Buchanan | Griffin | Mead | Thompson |
| Burtness | Hadley | Menges | Thurston |
| Burton | Hall, Ind. | Michaelson | Tillman |
| Busby | Hall, N. Dak. | Miller | Timberlake |
| Canfield | Hammer | Milligan | Tydings |
| Cannon | Hardy | Moore, Ky. | Vestal |
| Carew | Hastings | Morehead | Wefald |
| Carrs | Haugen | Morgan | Weller |
| Carter, Okla. | Hawley | Morrow | Welch, Calif. |
| Christopherson | Hickey | Murphy | Wheeler |
| Clague | Bill, Wash. | Nelson, Mo. | White, Kans. |
| Cole | Hoch | Nelson, Wis. | White, Me. |
| Collier | Hogg | O'Connor, N. Y. | Whittington |
| Collins | Holaday | Oldfield | Williams, Ill. |
| Colton | Howard | Oliver, Ala. | Williams, Tex. |
| Connally, Tex. | Hull, Tenn. | Oliver, N. Y. | Williamson |
| Cooper, Wis. | Hull, William E. | Parks | Wilson, Miss. |
| Corning | Irwin | Peavey | Winter |
| Cramton | Jacobstein | Peery | Wolverton |
| Crowther | James | Porter | Wood |
| Crumpacker | Jenkins | Pou | Woodruff |
| Cullen | Johnson, Ill. | Prall | Wurzbach |
| Dallinger | Johnson, Ind. | Purnell | Wyant |
| Davis | Johnson, Ky. | Quin | Yates |
| Denison | Johnson, S. Dak. | Ragon | Zihlman |
| Dickinson, Iowa | Johnson, Tex. | Rainey | |
| Dickinson, Mo. | Kearns | Ramseyer | |
| Dickstein | Keller | Rathbone | |

NAYS—147

- | | | | |
|----------------|--------------------|------------------|----------------|
| Abernethy | Drewry | Lankford | Smithwick |
| Ackerman | Eaton | Larsen | Sosnowski |
| Aldrich | Edwards | Lehbach | Spearing |
| Allgood | Ellis | Linthicum | Sproul, Ill. |
| Almon | Fairchild | Luce | Steagall |
| Andrew | Fenn | McDuffie | Stedman |
| Bacharach | Fish | McKeown | Stevenson |
| Bacon | Fitzgerald, Roy G. | McMillan | Stobbs |
| Begg | Fletcher | McSwain | Taber |
| Bell | Fort | McSweeney | Taylor, N. J. |
| Berger | Free | MacGregor | Taylor, W. Va. |
| Bland | Frothingham | Magee, N. Y. | Temple |
| Blanton | Gallivan | Magee, Pa. | Thatcher |
| Bowling | Gambrill | Mapes | Tilson |
| Brand, Ga. | Gibson | Martin, Mass. | Tincher |
| Brigham | Gifford | Michener | Tinkham |
| Britten | Glynn | Mooney | Tolley |
| Bulwinkle | Graham | Moore, Va. | Treadway |
| Butler | Hale | Nelson, Me. | Tucker |
| Campbell | Hare | Newton, Minn. | Underhill |
| Carter, Calif. | Harrison | O'Connell, R. I. | Underwood |
| Chalmers | Hersey | O'Connor, La. | Upshaw |
| Chapman | Hill, Ala. | Parker | Vincent, Mich. |
| Chindblom | Hill, Md. | Patterson | Vinson, Ga. |
| Cochran | Hooper | Perkins | Vinson, Ky. |
| Connery | Houston | Perlman | Wainwright |
| Cooper, Ohio | Huddleston | Rankin | Warren |
| Cox | Hull, Morton D. | Ransley | Wason |
| Crisp | Jeffers | Reed, N. Y. | Watres |
| Darrow | Jones | Rogers | Watson |
| Davenport | Kahn | Rouse | Weaver |
| Deal | Kelly | Rutherford | Welsh, Pa. |
| Dempsey | Kemp | Sanders, N. Y. | Whitehead |
| Doughton | Kerr | Sandlin | Wilson, La. |
| Douglass | Ketcham | Scott | Woodrum |
| Doyle | Kiess | Sears, Fla. | Wright |
| Drane | LaGuardia | Shreve | |

NOT VOTING—69

- | | | | |
|---------------|--------------|----------------|-------------------|
| Anthony | Coyle | Gorman | McClintic |
| Appleby | Crosser | Hayden | McLaughlin, Mich. |
| Beedy | Curry | Hudson | Madden |
| Bixler | Davey | Hudspeth | Manlove |
| Bowles | Foss | Johnson, Wash. | Merritt |
| Burdick | Fredericks | Kindred | Mills |
| Byrns | Freeman | King | Montague |
| Carpenter | Garner, Tex. | Kirk | Montgomery |
| Celler | Gilbert | Kurtz | Moore, Ohio |
| Cleary | Goldner | Lampert | Morin |
| Connolly, Pa. | Goldsborough | Lee, Ga. | Newton, Mo. |

- | | | | |
|------------------|---------------|---------------|----------|
| Norton | Seger | Sweet | Voigt |
| O'Connell, N. Y. | Snell | Reece | Walters |
| Phillips | Stephens | Taylor, Colo. | Wingo |
| Pratt | Strong, Pa. | Taylor, Tenn. | Woodyard |
| Quayle | Strother | Updike | |
| Reed, Ark. | Sullivan | Vaile | |
| Schafer | Summers, Tex. | Vare | |

So the previous question was ordered.

The following pairs were announced:

On the vote:

Mr. Manlove (for) with Mr. Hudspeth (against.)

Mr. Hudson (for) with Mr. Woodyard (against.)

General pairs:

Mr. Madden with Mr. Montague.

Mr. Connolly of Pennsylvania with Mr. Summers of Texas.

Mr. Anthony with Mr. Gilbert.

Mr. Walters with Mr. Byrns.

Mr. Lampert with Mr. Davey.

Mr. Kurtz with Mr. Hayden.

Mr. Moore of Ohio with Mr. Kindred.

Mr. Strong of Pennsylvania with Mrs. Norton.

Mr. Vare with Mr. Quayle.

Mr. McLaughlin of Michigan with Mr. Crosser.

Mr. Pratt with Mr. Cleary.

Mr. Newton of Missouri with Mr. Lee of Georgia.

Mr. Snell with Mr. Reed of Arkansas.

Mr. Curry with Mr. Wingo.

Mr. King with Mr. Sullivan.

Mr. Morin with Mr. Taylor of Colorado.

Mr. Sweet with Mr. O'Connell of New York.

Mr. Stephens with Mr. Goldsborough.

Mr. Mills with Mr. Celler.

Mr. Bixler with Mr. Garner.

Mr. Swoope with Mr. Schafer.

Mr. Segar with Mr. Voigt.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the farm relief bill.

The motion was agreed to.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The House is now in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 15474, of which the Clerk will read the title.

The Clerk read the title to the bill, as follows:

A bill (H. R. 15474) to establish a Federal farm board to aid in the orderly marketing and in the control and disposition of the surplus of agricultural commodities.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent to dispense with the first reading of the bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MAPES, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 15474, the farm relief bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

MEMORIAL BY STATE LEGISLATURE OF MINNESOTA REGARDING FLOOD SITUATION IN ROSEAU AND KITTSOON COUNTIES

Mr. WEFALD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WEFALD. Mr. Speaker, there exists in Roseau and Kittson Counties in Minnesota, which counties are part of my congressional district, a very serious situation for many farmers—recurring from year to year—due to overflow of the Roseau River, the complete correction of which can only be accomplished by joint action of the United States and the Dominion of Canada. I have already, some time ago, taken this matter up with our State Department to start action looking toward a just solution. I herewith present for the Record and for the information of the House the following resolution by the Minnesota Legislature:

Concurrent Resolution 2, memorializing the Congress of the United States to pass such legislation as may be appropriate and effectual, together with proper arrangements made with the Dominion of Canada, for the relief of certain territory in Roseau and Kittson Counties, Minn., from flood damage incident to the discharge of waters into said territory from the Dominion of Canada

Whereas a condition exists destructive to the agricultural interests and lands in the counties of Roseau and Kittson, in the State of Minnesota, because of the flood waters of certain streams having their sources partly in the Dominion of Canada, the same being therefore beyond the control of the State of Minnesota and the counties referred to; and

Whereas said lands lie within the basin of the Roseau River, comprising over 1,000 square miles, a part of said river being in the Dominion of Canada, and a great part of the water of said river coming from the Dominion of Canada and being discharged into the State of Minnesota; and

Whereas at the time of the settlement of the lands referred to large areas thereof were naturally arable and cultivated lands and were settled by good, intelligent, and industrious farmers, who developed valuable and productive farms and became prosperous citizens; and following the settlement of these farms there came the development of the meadow lands of said area, with additional prosperous farms and communities, until in the course of such development the run-off from said occupied lands was to the full capacity of said river; and

Whereas after the development of said lands by the farmers referred to there were constructed certain judicial ditches, the discharge of the waters from said ditches causing great damage to said settlers and to all the districts so affected; and

Whereas the State of Minnesota at several times endeavored to remedy this trouble by dredging out the channel of said Roseau River to increase its capacity, but in spite of this work so done the flood waters so discharged have backed out of the Roseau River onto the lands of said settlers, rendering them of little value, and with the probability that many of the settlers will be compelled to abandon them with loss of their life savings; and

Whereas the trouble and damage referred to has been materially increased by additional ditching of lands in the Dominion of Canada into the Roseau River, and for which said flood waters from said additional ditches there is no sufficient outlet; and

Whereas it appears that the several Canadian sources of the Roseau River have large watersheds with rolling contours capable of facilitating quick discharge of flood waters into an already over-charged river; and

Whereas in answer to an appeal from Canadian settlers in one of the watersheds referred to, the Canadian Government engineers are making a survey and estimate for ditching the district to discharge larger quantities of water into its branch of the Roseau River, while there is absolutely no provision for the disposition of these waters in the United States and in the counties referred to, and the said flood waters will be discharged back onto the lands of the settlers of these counties, without recourse by them, and that it is reasonably to be expected that this will be followed by similar projects for the benefit of the other parts of the Canadian watersheds until these United States lands are entirely ruined for the purposes for which they were developed; and

Whereas the Roseau River has its regular and proper outlet wholly through its channel across the international boundary into the Dominion of Canada, and such channel and outlet are insufficient to allow the proper discharge of these flood waters which are so to be discharged into this river, and the amount of the flood waters now so discharged is said to be so large as to injure the agriculture of Canadian lands adjacent to this outlet, and said Canadian Government surveyors are now at work in that district making an estimate in preparation for a system of dikes, whereby they may detain at about the international boundary these flood waters, including what they may elsewhere discharge from this river into the United States until such time as they can run off through the regular channel, which is insufficient to discharge these waters in proper time and manner; and if the Canadian plan for the making of such dikes is carried out it will result in the destruction of the fields of the farmers of Kittson and Roseau Counties, and without the intervention of Congress these farmers will be helpless to prevent said destruction; and

Whereas the commissioner of drainage and waters of Minnesota has caused to be made a survey of Roseau River from the foot of Roseau Lake to a point about 16 miles below and across the Canadian boundary line, and finds it is practicable to dredge a new channel in the river to such point, with a fall of approximately 0.48 foot per mile, which will release the flood waters of said river in time to relieve the farmers on both sides of the international boundary line from most of the damage now being inflicted by said floods; and

Whereas it is beyond the power of the owners of the affected lands or said counties or the State of Minnesota to deal directly with the Dominion of Canada in this matter, and it is altogether likely that the Canadian authorities would be willing to enter into an arrangement with the United States by which the two Governments would be able

to do the dredging and other work jointly, with a proportionate share of the expense to be apportioned to and borne by each; and

Whereas the expense of this undertaking would be a sum far beyond the paying ability of the owners of the lands affected, and part of the lands covered by the basin of the Roseau River are government lands subject to homestead entry and which, if they were improved by this proposed channel would become valuable lands and largely increased in value: Now therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Minnesota (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States be, and it is hereby, memorialized to enact such legislation as may effectuate the purposes and relief hereinbefore set forth to the end that joint action may be taken by the Governments of the United States and the Dominion of Canada; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution, duly authenticated by the proper officers of both houses, be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Secretary of War, the Presiding Officers of the Senate and House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative, from the State of Minnesota, in the Congress.

W. I. NOLAN,

President of the Senate.

JOHN A. JOHNSON,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Passed the senate the 18th day of January, 1927.

GEO. W. PRACHEY,

Secretary of the Senate.

Passed the house of representatives the 19th day of January, 1927.

JOHN J. LEVIN,

Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.

Approved January 20, 1927.

THEODORE CHRISTIANSON,

Governor of the State of Minnesota.

Filed January 20, 1927.

MIKE HOLM,

Secretary of State.

I, Mike Holm, secretary of state of the State of Minnesota, and keeper of the great seal, do hereby certify that the above is a true and correct copy of the resolution filed in my office, January 20, 1927.

[SEAL.]

MIKE HOLM,

Secretary of State.

AGRICULTURE

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Louisiana asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I am not a Daniel come to judgment. I do not believe that I know it all. I am going to vote against the bill popularly known as the McNary-Haugen bill. Perhaps it would be better for me to say that it is generally known by that hyphenation. I think this proposed legislation has been discussed in every village, town, city, hamlet, and rural community in the United States. Perhaps in these places the general attitude has been favorable for obvious reasons.

The measure has, I think, aroused the opposition of the larger communities, known as big cities, because the people in these great centers feel that the consumer will have to absorb the tremendously added cost to the prevailing rates of the commodities on which they live. Many students of economics, regardless of their geographical situation, are opposed to the measure on the ground that it is fundamentally unsound, unfeasible, unworkable, and not in accordance with the governmental policy outlined in our Constitution. In the North, East, South, and West are highly intellectual opponents of the bill, though it is fair to admit that it has proponents and advocates among the illuminati and cognoscenti even, while unquestionably it has innumerable champions who have no claim to so dignified and high-sounding a title. I am not going to attempt to pronounce an infallible judgment. Long experience has convinced me that no man possesses the infallible touchstone of truth. Men equally honest and sincere will arrive at different conclusions from the facts on which they agree. I concede to others that which I know will be freely granted to myself—the right to express an opinion of the legislation or proposed legislation which is under consideration without rancor or ill feeling. I am convinced if enacted into law it will add to the already high cost of living, not only to the consuming masses of the great cities but to all of the people throughout the length and breadth of the land. In my judgment, it would be an absolute act of folly for southern Members to vote for this bill. The South pays for feedstuff and foodstuff now \$1,500,000,000 annually. This bill will enlarge and increase this vast expendi-

ture by cotton farmers and the people of the South, who can not reasonably hope for any compensation, in view of the fact that more than 60 per cent of their great staple is shipped abroad and its value determined by the world price. I think that the majority of our farmers and planters are opposed to the provisions of the McNary-Haugen bill. They are learning that it is the invention of a relatively few who, with the fervor of those imbued with the spirit of parental pride, cling as tenaciously to their plan as ever mother clung to a distorted child.

That mysterious, uncontrollable, and irresistible attachment is one of the freakish tendencies of human nature which has always excited the curiosity of philosophers and the vehement denunciation of less tranquil natures. The fanatical fury of the extreme prohibitionist is only another evidence of this ineradicable tendency of many natures to hold to that which has sprung from their brain. The classical attachment of Jove to Minerva, who sprang armed cap-a-pie from his brain, is a classical illustration of what has been deemed to be a morbid affection through the generations of the past since the beginning of man's romantic and tragic career upon this terrestrial ball that has been spinning around on its axis and whirling around the sun from the time when it sprang into existence as the result of a compression of gases in the long eons ago. That tendency will continue to operate until old mother earth stumbles out of her path and goes rambling into unknown space, which, of course, means good night for the human race, even if men and women should continue in this world of change to play out the grand drama of life until that spectacular event comes to pass. Even when convinced that a modification of their plan would bring about a realization of what should be their hopes to a larger and greater advantage do extremists hold with a greater fury to the original plan. When radicalism is rampant the voice of liberalism is hushed or it can not be heard above the uproar and din created by the army who shout for a change on the theory it can not be any worse than that which they claim we presently suffer.

My opposition to this bill is not based upon antagonism to farmers. I believe that it is agreed that no one wishes to see agriculture suffer. The amount carried by the bill, \$250,000,000, is but a fraction of what the Nation would gladly vote for farm relief if the people could be sure that the money would be devoted to actual farm relief and accomplish the purpose desired. It is because the McNary-Haugen bill sets up a bureaucracy in Washington to boost the cost of living to all in order that a relatively few might benefit that it is opposed. The measure, if enacted, would not be merely a temporary evil. It would be a burning sore, a cancer spot, arraying one class of Americans against another class and stirring up hate and reprisal. It would tend to transform this Government by placing it upon the false foundation of class favoritism instead of a square deal for all.

Two kinds of Americans would be created by this bill, one kind paying tribute to the other. Absolute control of the people's bread and meat would be placed in the hands of a bureau in Washington to manipulate as the bureau saw fit. This bureau would not be the Government, but a supergovernment, not amenable to the President or Congress. It could gamble in wheat, cotton, hogs, tobacco, rice, and any other crop that it might declare to be staple. It violates the Constitution in essence and in spirit and, in my judgment, would be declared by the courts illegal, null, and void.

I repeat that I am for the farmer. It is almost trite to say that agriculture is the basis of our civilization. I want to help it if I can and sustain it as the foundation on which a mighty civilization has been erected as a wonderful and glittering superstructure. I think I have the key, the magical key, that will unlock the door of hope and prosperity and keep it open permanently. If enacted into law, the bill which I have introduced in the House (H. R. 5025), the counterpart of which was introduced in the Senate by Senator CAMERON, would prove the open sesame to a prosperity so great as to deservedly secure the appellation of a land flowing with milk and honey. It is the old Newlands bill polished and brought up to date. Thousands of our citizens are hurrying to its support. Its friends will press for its enactment in the next Congress. If the parliamentary situation permitted it would be a blessing to substitute it for the McNary-Haugen bill. Such a substitution would prove "good tidings of a great joy" to those who understand the blessings that would flow from a beneficial use of the waters of the United States. Nothing in Ovid's "Metamorphoses" would equal the change of a great liability that threatens the country in many places with overflow and disaster into an agency that would be the Nation's greatest asset, for it would mean the development of power, the control of floods, the navigation of our rivers and inland streams, the

reclamation of swamp lands, the irrigation of arid lands, so that the desert will rejoice and blossom as the rose. For, my friends, reclamation in its largest significance is a national problem.

Reclamation in the South is just as important to our ultimate development as it was in the West, taking the West as a whole, but it must be approached from a different angle.

Irrigation in the West was in many places an indispensable necessity for the production of crops. Without it, plant or tree growth for food or fruits, was impossible. The country, in its natural condition was uninhabitable. Reclamation had to go before home-making on the land. "Necessity is the mother of invention." Necessity forced reclamation.

The smaller projects were within reach of private enterprise. The larger projects required aid from the Federal Government.

In the West, there was not enough water.

In the South there is too much water.

Swamp areas requiring drainage are of enormous extent. Even greater areas are under the menace of devastating floods.

In many localities seasonal or occasional overflow ruins the crops and prevents the prosperity of the farmers.

What we need in the South is not so much the artificial application of water to produce crops, as the regulation and control of the water resources so there will be no damage from overflow or lack of proper drainage to prevent cultivation and production.

Yet the fact doubtless exists that in many sections, where the physical conditions are adapted to it, the application of water artificially may save a crop from injury or destruction by drought or may so stimulate plant growth as to more than compensate for the expense of the artificial application of water for plant growth.

In my own State of Louisiana there have been years when the farmers in some parts of the State found pumping for irrigation of crops usually raised without it to be equivalent to crop insurance.

Water is indispensable for irrigation in the rice fields.

The enlargement of our supplies for that region is one of the pressing agricultural problems of Louisiana.

What Louisiana, and in fact the whole South, needs is the complete control of our water resources for all beneficial uses to which they can be devoted and all damage from floods obviated. We must accomplish this great public need or our development and prosperity will be greatly hampered and diminished.

We must put an end to floods by using the water beneficially and under control before it forms a flood.

In my State the necessity for Federal cooperation and aid through a nation-wide policy for reclamation has been strongly urged for a number of years. In evidence of this I will ask you to bear with me while I read a resolution adopted by the New Orleans Association of Commerce, which is as follows:

Resolution of the Board of Directors of the New Orleans Association of Commerce, adopted August 10, 1921, indorsing the Bankhead bill, H. R. 6048, Sixty-seventh Congress, first session

Whereas the aid and cooperation given by the National Government in the great work of reclaiming the arid lands in the western half of the United States has created home markets for American merchants and manufacturers on a vast scale, and has resulted in widespread prosperity in all sections of the West where works for reclamation have been built by the National Government under the Newlands Reclamation Act, and has largely contributed to the commercial and industrial prosperity of the country at large; and

Whereas the people of the West are now unitedly working for an enlargement of this great prosperity-promoting policy and for the passage by Congress of a law adequate to that end which will finance reclamation construction on a large enough scale to prove of immediate advantage to all commercial and manufacturing interests in the United States; and

Whereas the extension of this national policy of governmental aid and cooperation in the reclamation and settlement of lands that are now waste and unproductive will bring to the South the same great stimulus to prosperity that was conferred on the West by the passage of the Newlands Reclamation Act in 1902, and should have the same united and vigorous support from the South that it has from the West, and the policy should be extended in its operations to the entire United States; and

Whereas the State of Louisiana embraces a larger area of lands eventually susceptible of reclamation than is now reclaimed in all the West, an area larger than the reclaimable area in any other one State; and the State of Louisiana, and all its agricultural, commercial, and industrial interests will benefit more than any other State from this desired enlargement of the policy of national aid and cooperation for the reclamation and settlement of waste lands: Now therefore be it

Resolved by the Association of Commerce of the City of New Orleans, That the passage of the Bankhead bill, which extends the policy of national aid and cooperation for reclamation to the entire United States, provides for the settlement of the reclaimed lands by ex-service men, as well as other settlers, and appropriates an adequate amount for the construction of works for reclamation and operations under the act, he, and is hereby, urged upon the President and the Congress of the United States, and that the support of the commercial and industrial interests of the United States should be actively extended to this bill, which has for its purpose the extension of internal trade and the creation of home markets, that will never be affected by foreign complications; and that the Senators and Congressmen from Louisiana be most earnestly urged to use every effort to secure the passage of said Bankhead bill with as little delay as possible.

The Bankhead bill was a wise and well-considered measure which its advocates then believed, and still believe, would cure the defects in the national reclamation act, which has gone on the rocks largely because of its inadequate provisions for community responsibility.

But I am convinced, and in that view I am not alone, that if we are to secure a policy of "reclamation for the South," that it must be a nation-wide policy and must begin, not with reclamation, primarily, but with the control of flood waters at their sources, the prevention of the formation of floods, and the protection of all lands devoted to agriculture from floods or drought, either annual or periodical.

A map of Louisiana shows at a glance, when the overflow area is indicated on it, as it is on the map I hold in my hand, how essential to the problem of water control and use is flood control. At least 10,000 square miles was overflowed in the great flood of 1912, and the damage to farms and plantations cried to heaven for some permanent guaranty against its repetition.

It has been estimated that in the entire State of Louisiana there are 10,000,000 acres, now waste and uninhabited, that would be the most fertile and densely populated region of the country if the problem were solved of controlling floods and feeding the water to plant growth as needed instead of too much or too little so much of the time as under present unregulated conditions.

The magnitude of this problem may be appreciated when the comparison is made between Louisiana and one of the most productive areas of the world's surface and most densely populated.

LOOK AT A MAP OF LOUISIANA

DENMARK

Draw a line across Louisiana straight west from Natchez. Above that line lies a territory within Louisiana larger than Denmark. Then read H. Rider Haggard's book, *Rural Denmark*, and you will realize what might be developed in that section of northern Louisiana.

BELGIUM

Draw a parallel line across Louisiana through Baton Rouge. Between that line and the Natchez line lies a territory larger than Belgium. Why not build another Belgium in that section of Louisiana?

HOLLAND

Between the Baton Rouge line and the Gulf of Mexico lies a territory one-third larger than Holland, and with larger natural resources. Like Holland, large areas of it must be reclaimed, but if Holland can reclaim the Zuyder Zee, shall the United States of America surrender south Louisiana to the uninhabited wastes or shall it transform the marshes into rich and fertile meadows as densely populated as those of Holland?

The people of the South, and particularly the merchants and manufacturers of the State, if they would put into a great war against the devastating and waste-making forces of nature the same energy that they put forth in the World War, could put as large a population in Louisiana within 20 years as the 17,000,000 who now inhabit Denmark, Belgium, and Holland, and could develop it from year to year with incredible rapidity, and enlarge the population of the whole South in the same proportion.

In my judgment, we may make great progress with our plans for "Reclamation in the South" if we will begin at the right end.

I believe the right end to be the control of the floods at their sources and the regulation of the flow of the rivers, so that floods will cease to menace the farmers in the lower reaches of the rivers.

That whole plan, for many years known as the Newlands plan, is one of the best matured legislative measures that ever awaited the final approval of Congress to be inaugurated and put into practical operation.

It would then constitute a foundation on which to operate with safety under the Bankhead bill, which would greatly strengthen the movement for that most beneficial measure.

In my remarks in the House of Representatives in behalf of this pending measure, now known as the O'Connor-Cameron-Newlands bills, H. R. 5025 and S. 4710, I have, as opportunity offered, undertaken to present the facts establishing its necessity to that body. In brief, it creates an administrative coordinating commission to bring into close harmony and cooperation all the services and bureaus of the Federal Government with each other and with all State and local agencies in the making of comprehensive plans on each watershed, treating each as a unit, which will evolve the highest possible beneficial uses of the now wasted flood waters, and in that way not only provide for their use beneficially but also provide by such use for covering the cost of flood prevention plans which would otherwise be impossible because of their prohibitive cost.

I can not too strongly urge the most careful study of this plan on all who are present on this occasion. I believe it is the basic foundation upon which we must proceed before we can get "reclamation for the South" or any adequate Federal aid for such a policy.

We must not overlook the fact that this measure does not run into any of the defective provisions or agricultural opposition, which has made any present extension of Federal aid to reclamation in the West exceedingly difficult, if not impossible.

What we want in the South is not that areas of lands now unproductive shall be rescued from the desert and made to blossom as the rose. What we want, primarily, is to have the menace of destructive overflows lifted from our present farmers over a vast area. We want the erosion of our farm lands stopped. We want our farmers made more prosperous by a better utilization of their water asset. We want that asset brought within their reach.

In other words, we want to help the farmer who is now farming land to do so more profitably and successfully, and in building from that foundation the creation of new farmers or new communities we do not plan the doing of that with any such rapidity as might awaken the hostility of the agricultural interests for fear of increased competition from increased agricultural areas.

ARTICLE BY REAR ADMIRAL M'GOWAN

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record by printing a brief article prepared by Rear Admiral McGowan.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted by unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I submit the following to be printed as a part thereof, having been prepared by Rear Admiral Samuel McGowan, United States Navy, retired:

THE WAY TO WORLD PEACE

Amend the Constitution of the United States now so as to require that, before war can be declared or participated in—except only in the event of attack or invasion—there must be a referendum; that, if the majority of the votes cast are for peace, there the matter ends; that, if the majority be for war, every able-bodied citizen between the ages of 18 and 50 shall be drafted for service, either military or industrial, wherever he or she can be of the most use and that all profits in excess of 5 per cent received by any person, firm or corporation from the day war is declared until peace is finally concluded shall be turned over to the Government.

Our best contribution toward world peace ought to consist in making it most difficult for us to become involved in war; and, with public opinion consulted in advance and with plans already worked out and well understood for effectually controlling both labor and capital and thereby eliminating the element of sordid self-interest by putting profiteering out of everybody's reach, the possibility of the United States engaging in another war should attain the irreducible minimum consistent with national honor.

Ours is a popular form of government—of the people, by the people, for the people—and the majority is supposed to rule.

If the Nation be at any time in actual danger, its citizens can safely be trusted to rally to its defense; but equally surely may they be relied on not to be suddenly stampeded by ill-considered war enthusiasm.

By amending its own Constitution as outlined and thus setting a practical example which every other nation could—and many, if not all, might—follow, the United States would be taking its place and doing its share toward preserving world peace.

FARM RELIEF

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members of the House be permitted to extend their remarks

on the McNary-Haugen bill now under consideration for five legislative days, beginning at the conclusion of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Connecticut asks unanimous consent that all Members of the House may be permitted to extend remarks in the RECORD on the McNary-Haugen bill for five legislative days after the conclusion of the bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Speaker, under general leave to extend remarks I am offering to be printed, first, a concurrent resolution by the General Assembly of South Carolina, memorializing the Members of Congress from South Carolina, to seek to have passed legislation providing for the establishment of a Federal farm board to control the marketing of surplus crops, and stating that the inclusion of an equalization fee, with proper safeguards to prevent the same from becoming excessive, would not be objectionable.

Mr. Speaker, I have been greatly impressed with the analogy with the situation now confronting Congress with reference to the control of surplus farm products and that confronting Congress in 1913 respecting the control of the reserve funds belonging to the banks of the United States. I am therefore printing, as a part of my remarks, certain remarks made by such distinguished Senators as Senator Root, of New York, Senator BURTON, of Ohio, Senator McCumber, of North Dakota, Senator Smith, of Michigan, Senator NORRIS, of Nebraska, Senator BORAH, of Idaho, Senator Cummins, of Iowa, Senator SMOOR, of Utah, and others, expressing their very pronounced objections to various aspects of the Federal reserve banking system, then under consideration. I seriously doubt if a single one of the distinguished Senators then prophesying dire calamities from the enactment of the national reserve banking law ever subsequently introduced a bill to repeal the same. At any rate the approval of said act is now practically universal; bankers and business men, lawyers and doctors, preachers and teachers, farmers and foresters, miners and mechanics, laborers and longshoremen, Democrats and Republicans, all unitedly agree that the establishment of the Federal reserve system in banking was the greatest forward movement ever inaugurated in the fiscal system of our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I am wondering and hoping that some such beneficent result may come out of the tremendous struggle now going on with regard to the establishment of a Federal farm reserve system. The surplus crops of one year should be held in reserve for the shortages of the next year and American bumper crops should be so distributed to the domestic market and to the world as to stabilize the price by making uniform the supply, and thus stabilizing all business conditions, and bringing blessings to bankers, merchants, professional men, as well as farmers, both east and west, both north and south.

A concurrent resolution

Whereas the agricultural prosperity of our country depends upon the effective control of surplus crop production; and

Whereas this problem is of such magnitude as to be national in its scope; and

Whereas the condition of the farmers throughout the Nation affects the very foundations of our social structure: Now therefore be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That our United States Senators and Representatives in Congress be, and they hereby are, memorialized to use their influence for the prompt passage of such national legislation as will provide for the creation of a Federal farm board composed of farmers, which will put agriculture on a par with industry and can effectively control the marketing of surplus crops, and that the incorporation of an equalization fee in such legislation, with proper safeguards to prevent it from becoming excessive, would not be objectionable; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the United States Senators and Representatives in Congress from South Carolina.

I hereby certify that the above is a true copy of a concurrent resolution adopted by the house of representatives and concurred in by the senate.

[SEAL.]

J. WILSON GIBLEES,

Clerk, House of Representatives, South Carolina.

FEBRUARY 11, 1927.

FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,

Legislative Reference Service.

[Extracts from CONGRESSIONAL RECORD (October 9, 1913, to December 3, 1913) giving predictions by certain Senators of unfavorable results of Federal Reserve Act.]

Mr. McLEAN. Under the bill as it passed the House, 12 or more banks, controlled by the bankers and owned by the bankers, would,

in my opinion, bring but little if any improvement over the present system. If an attempt to locate these banks did not bring on civil war owing to local jealousies and political complications, all sorts of sectional rivalries and political deals would be possible. The regional banks will, to be sure, be nominally under the supervision of a central board of control, but if the immediate banking operations are left to the bankers and we ever have periods of depression, almost anything may happen. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, December 9, 1913, p. 497.)

Mr. HITCHCOCK. On the other hand, if you have 8 or 10 or 12 reserve banks you make each bank subject to the conditions of the territory in which it operates, and being subject to those influences, it will be compelled to charge its member banks a higher rate of discount because of the scarcity of the funds in the territory where it exists. You will have the same condition which exists now—high rates of interest in the sparsely settled parts of the country, in the South and West, and low rates of interest in the districts of the older and more settled East. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, December 11, 1913, p. 612.)

Mr. CRAWFORD. Why should the Government say to the banks, "You and you alone shall be required to do it?" Upon what theory does that principal rest and why should such a power as that be exerted to compel the banks to take this stock? Suppose the banks yield, as I presume they will, to that coercive feature of the bill and take this stock; then you will have forced an exclusive privilege upon the subscribing banks, whether they so consider it or not, because, as stockholders, you have confined the ownership to a class; you have given them the exclusive right to purchase and own that stock. I want to ask my friends on the other side of the Chamber, do they really consider that that is democratic? (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, December 11, 1913, p. 654.)

It is no idle complaint that comes from these country banks. They began protesting against this discrimination the first time they had an opportunity to examine the bill. They have been protesting against it ever since.

The other day my colleague, Mr. Sterling, put letter after letter into the RECORD from bankers in the State which we have the honor to represent in which that was their principal objection. They are not to have any benefit. This bill denies to them the benefit which those who favor the legislation maintain is its principal purpose; that is, to have a system that will readily extend relief to the banks of the country at a time when relief is imperative. That is the very time and the only time these people will want to use these banks. And when that time comes you have so restricted the class of paper that shall be recognized that they will be denied any benefit from it. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, December 17, 1913, p. 1067.)

Mr. ROOT. You will perceive that that provision contains in its terms no limit whatever upon the quantity of notes that may be issued:

Federal reserve notes, to be issued at the discretion of the Federal Reserve Board for the purpose of making advances to Federal reserve banks. * * *

The said notes shall be obligations of the United States.

That, sir, is to my view a plain, simple enlargement of the national currency of the United States. It is authority for the increase, practically, of what we call greenbacks. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, December 13, 1913, p. 812.)

Now, let me turn more directly to the consequences of the inflation which seems to me to be inevitable if we pass this bill as it is. I have said that a crash inevitably comes from the kind of process which easy money produces. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, December 13, 1913, p. 816.)

Of course, those notes, taking them in the aggregate, constitute an element of danger, because they come pretty near being demand obligations, and if before they come due doubt is created, if before they become due an unfavorable judgment about the financial policy of the United States is created abroad, then look out. They will have to be paid. If they are not paid, what will happen? The destruction of credit, not alone of the railroads issuing them, not alone of the banks holding them, but of the multitude of people who are carrying on their business and securing capital upon the securities, the stocks and bonds, of the corporations which have issued the short-term notes. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, December 13, 1913, p. 817.)

If this bill passes as it stands, America stands to lose all we saved when Grant vetoed the inflation bill, all we saved when we elected McKinley, all the Republicans, all the gold Democrats saved when they helped in the repudiation of the vital principle which has been put into this bill. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Dec. 13, 1913, p. 819.)

I think I never saw anything more preposterous than this proposition since Mr. Micawber discharged his pecuniary obligations by giving his personal note of hand. I never saw anything so absurd as to authorize banks to secure their debts by a reserve consisting of a part of their debts. It seems to me, Mr. President, that our friends on the other side, having introduced into the bill a measure of protection against inflation, however unsatisfactory and inadequate it may be,

are bound to keep the bill filled with other provisions which will make that protection entirely nugatory. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, December 19, 1913, p. 1229.)

Mr. BURTON. Has the Senator from Indiana read the section which contains a prohibition against dealing with nonmember banks, which would build up a monopoly in banking instead of stabilizing the banking system of the country—a provision which has awakened protest all over the country? My attention was called to it yesterday by the Senator from Iowa in a letter written from that State—a provision which would exclude thousands of banks, hundreds in many States, from continuing their business. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, December 17, 1913, p. 1049.)

Consider, then, what you would include here under this bill—whether it pertains to the whole United States, or whether it relates to 4 or 8 or 12 different districts. Different banks would charge different rates of interest on loans, and they would allow different rates of interest on deposits. Those who had funds could deposit them in any one of these banks, whether at home or in some remote place, whether at a high or low rate of interest, with an equal degree of certainty or security. The inevitable effect would be that capital which belonged to one community would emigrate to others where it did not belong, because through speculation or injudicious investments higher rates of interest were charged to borrowers and promised to lenders. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, December 17, 1913, p. 1057.)

It has been repeatedly denied here and elsewhere that this measure would be used in any way for political purposes. It has been repeatedly said by the friends and proponents of this bill that the men who would be appointed to this Federal board would be of the same high standing and command the same confidence as the members of the Supreme Court. Its success depends upon the confidence of the people, and it depends upon the degree in which the members will be able to ignore political considerations and recognize their unprecedented responsibility. Here, however, we have offered a provision to exclude their subordinates from the protection afforded by the civil service law.

A very vigorous protest was raised here when legislation to this same effect was adopted in regard to deputy marshals and deputy internal-revenue collectors; but, to use the vernacular, I think this is the limit. This means that you are going to bring this entire system into politics instead of keeping it out. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, December 18, 1913, p. 1144.)

You are proposing to establish a great system of finance, but not one that is fair to the whole country, not one that gives to the young man who has graduated from the grammar school or from some other educational institution an equal opportunity with the favorite of the members of this board, for you say, "Throw aside the civil-service law; ignore its provisions." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, December 18, 1913, p. 1151.)

Dangers of inflation lurk in this to a degree that is unthinkable. After a bank might have used all its gold, all the greenbacks, all the forms of money which are now in vogue for reserves, it might go still further and proceed indefinitely to issue these notes, pyramiding the reserves, basing loans on false credit, until there would be a degree of expansion not only dangerous to the country but, I insist, even ruinous. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, December 19, 1913, p. 1228.)

It is possible that by the process of evolution this bank may become so similar to a central bank that most of the benefit of one unified institution may be secured. It is my humble opinion, however, that the chances are against such a possibility and that in due time we shall become convinced that we must follow the example of every other advanced nation of the globe and have a central bank. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, December 19, 1913, p. 1233.)

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, the trouble with both of these bills is that they seek only to meet the contingency of overcredit by issuing a new currency to obviate the necessity of calling on the Government to supply the demand. The Federal reserve bank takes the place of the Government. Neither bill goes to the root of the evil—the prevention of undue speculation. But worse than this, both of them invite extravagance and speculation by making what you call easy credit for the time being. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, December 17, 1913, p. 1052.)

Nor is this assured inflation, this assured debasement of our money, with its wrongs to the industries, the only vice of these measures. Both of them send us a long way into the realm of ultimate paternalism. The Government forces a partnership with every national bank in the country. * * *

With all due respect to the divers authors of these substitutes, I insist that this is an act of astounding governmental tyranny. * * * Under their provisions the disease of inflation will become and remain a chronic condition. * * *

In these bills you open these gates wide, and sooner or later you will pay a dire penalty for that indiscretion, a penalty that will far outweigh the temporary benefit which you may hope to accomplish by diluting and debasing the people's money. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, December 17, 1913, p. 1053.)

You have made it easy to inflate for the purpose of speculation in the great cities of the country, but you have drawn the lines. You say: "While we can and will inflate the currency of the country, while

we allow this to be done throughout the great cities and for the purposes of speculation in those cities, we draw the line against the country section, which has practically nothing but the paper which matures in six months and longer." In other words, you subject those sections of the country to all the evils of your inflation, with the higher prices that result from it, in your great cities; but you give them none of the benefits which are supposed to flow from all evils, because all of them are supposed to have some element of benefit. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, December 17, 1913, p. 1073.)

In simple, plain English the purpose of this bill has been, and the operation of this law will be, an inflation of our currency as a tonic to revive us temporarily from the assured depression following our recent tariff legislation. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, December 18, 1913, p. 1160.)

Mr. GRONNA. We find the majority party apparently determined on the passage of a measure which will legalize money trusts and credit trusts in the different sections of the country—not more than 12 nor less than 8. The 8 or 12 regional banks established will have a monopoly of the rediscounting of commercial paper in their respective districts and will have a monopoly on the receiving of the reserves of the banks in their respective districts, and combined these 8 or 12 banks will have a similar monopoly extending all over the country. * * * And there is nothing to prevent these eight regional banks from combining into one great system, and when they do you have just as effective control over the business of the country by this combination of banks as you would have if there were one great privately controlled central bank.

* * * The pending bill provides for a concentration of the control of money and credit within the eight districts provided for and hands this concentrated control over to the bankers of that district. If the interests of the banks of that district and the interests of the people and business in that district conflict, does anyone doubt what interests the reserve banks so controlled will take care of? Or if a condition should arise when men would differ as to the proper course to pursue and the view of a person as to the better course would depend upon his training and association, does anyone maintain that a reserve bank controlled by the bankers of the district would not be likely to adopt the course most favorable to the bankers?

* * * If there has been possible a dangerous concentration of control of money and credit under our present system, what is going to happen under a system where such concentration of control is encouraged by law? (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, December 17, 1913, p. 1054.)

Currency can be issued to the extent of \$5,100,000,000. I believe it must be admitted that this would be an undue inflation of the currency. And with an inflation of the currency follows an inflation of credit. For every inflated dollar there may be from six to eight dollars of inflated credit, as the reserve requirements are from 12 to 18 per cent. It is not to be expected that this inflation will all be brought about at once. It is the natural course, however, for inflation to demand more inflation. As the currency is increased beyond the rightful demands of business, money becomes more plentiful, prices rise, speculation is encouraged, business is extended, the demand for currency increases, both because the rising prices necessitate more money in order to carry on the same amount of business as formerly and because of the demands for credit made by new and extended enterprises resulting from a seeming prosperity, more currency is issued, and the cycle is repeated until the inevitable crash comes. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, December 17, 1913, p. 1055.)

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I do not think State banks will care to enter into this arrangement at all. They deal in mortgages and a vastly different form of credit from the form of credit contemplated by this bill. In fact, I think many national banks will enter the other field. If they do, and the number of banks that go into this regional reserve system is cut down very materially, it will not be a difficult thing for them to have a definite understanding with one another, which will make the so-called money trust, against which you inveigh, look like a rope of sand, for while they "hold the bag" the people of the United States, through the Federal Treasury, will fill it for their favorites without charge. No! I am very suspicious of your remedy—very suspicious of it. If I had not heard you advocate so often political principles that have turned out to be utterly fallacious, I might have more faith in it. I read in every one of your faces chagrin and mortification over some of the nonsensical things you have championed in the past; and you will fly from this banking remedy to some other less effective cure-all just as soon as you discover your mistake. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, December 18, 1913, p. 1133.)

Yes; but I am inclined to the belief that when the bill that is now before the Senate shall have ripened into law and the banks of the country and the stockholders thereof understand the serious situation into which they have been precipitated the changes will be from National to State charters rather than from State to National. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, December 18, 1912, p. 1142.)

Mr. BRISTOW. It probably is not only to relieve the financial disturbance that is imminent as a result of the unrest that has been

created by this administration and the legislation that has been passed and proposed to be passed, but also to satisfy the horde of hungry office seekers that have been besieging the Capital for the last 10 months. It is now proposed to unload some of them upon this great banking establishment that is to be created. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, December 18, 1913, p. 1145.)

I shall not cast my vote for any bill that organizes, under the forms of law, banking trusts that can control credit and that will be more powerful than any control of credit that has been heretofore organized. As I said upon another occasion, this bill may become a benevolent monopoly, but there are seeds of evil sown in it which I think are dangerous. I believe it will lead to inflation.

It has been said—and the statement has been criticized—that it will not only inflate but that it will also contract. The first influence will be a contraction; the second influence, to follow the contraction, will be, in my opinion, inflation. I predict—and it is dangerous to predict, I know—that this bill will be amended time and again before it has been in operation a year, in order to save the country from calamity and misfortune. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, December 19, 1913, p. 1252.)

It is one of the astounding things that this measure, which we were told some two months ago was not to be political in any sense of the word, should have developed into a strictly partisan political institution, its organization to be perfected by the political party that holds Andrew Jackson as one of its patron saints. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Dec. 23, 1913, p. 1490.)

Mr. TOWNSEND. Please notice that the very first reason given for failure is "politics." And yet with this experience of Oklahoma in the operation of the banking law in that State it is now proposed by the advocates of this bill to write into a law for the Nation the inexcusable mistake of political control. It can result in no good. It may, it probably will, result in disaster. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Dec. 18, 1913, p. 1146.)

And yet at this time, when the claim is made that things are too high, thereby showing by the same rule that there is a redundancy of money, it is proposed to pass a law for political purposes which will make money more plentiful, without regard to its quality. Under existing conditions if such a result follows it will be a mistake. Such a law can not be passed and the country still maintain that stable prosperity, that sure progress which it has enjoyed and ought to continue to enjoy. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, December 23, 1913, p. 1500.)

I think that this bill creates a political machine—one of the greatest political machines that has ever been created by legislation. Mr. President, the modern cry has been against political machines, and yet under the sanction of law it is proposed to create one whose possible baneful effects may control the finances of our country. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, December 23, 1913, p. 1500.)

So, Mr. President, believing, as I do, that this bill is not carefully framed, believing that it is possible under it—nay, probable under it—to inflate the currency to such an extent as to bring disaster to the country, believing that it is framed upon partisan lines for political purposes and that a currency bill should not be a partisan measure, believing that instead of restoring order it will add to existing confusion, I have felt it my duty to vote against this conference report. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, December 23, 1913, p. 1500.)

Mr. NORRIS. When the system provided for in this measure gets into politics we will have a political machine that will reach into every village where a bank is located. Its influence will extend to and be felt by every man who has to patronize a bank, either to borrow money or to deposit money. It will be almost limitless. It may be several years before its power will be fully gained; that is true of every political machine; but you will be sowing the seed, if you pass this amendment, that will eventually disgrace and bring into disrepute the very system that we are trying to adopt. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, December 18, 1913, p. 1147.)

Mr. BORAH. We ought to write into this law, without hesitation and without division in this body, in plain and unmistakable terms that that which the Government puts out as money or to serve the purposes of money shall have all the functions and equalities of money which a sovereign Government can give it. Unless we do this, this measure will go out to the world wearing the brand, which so many measures touching the currency have worn before, of special privilege, the taint of cowardice, the shuffling pretense of what was promised to be a clean, broad measure in the interests of the whole people.

Mr. President, the last 20 years have been portentous years in the history of this Republic. One hundred more of the same drift, and whatever else we may have we will not have a representative Republic. Centralization of industry, centralization of commerce, centralization of banking, centralization of credits, and all in private hands, and the Government yielding to them little by little from time to time its sovereign powers and duties.

* * * This Government should assert its power and exert its prerogatives, and nowhere is it more essential and vital that it do so than in the complete regulation and control of the money and currency of its people. Everything that performs the functions of money, whether technically money or not, should come under this control. This is the first and indispensable step toward the attainment of that power on the part of the Government which will enable it to deal with the great financial and industrial combinations which now exist. Unless we take this step all efforts to regulate and control other matters will prove futile. We should begin now. Every dollar of currency and money should be coined and provided for and controlled exclusively by the Government and then leave to private institutions and individuals to establish credit upon their own responsibilities. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, December 18, 1913, p. 1211.)

Mr. CUMMINS. I regret very much—it is impossible for me to say adequately how much I do regret—that we have departed from the almost universal sentiment of the country, which, I think, requires that the Federal reserve banks should be controlled by the Government of the United States for two reasons: First, in order that they might distribute the reserves so as best to serve or promote the general welfare; second, to counteract what might be called and what has been called the conspiracy of wealth. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, December 19, 1913, p. 1221.)

Mr. WEEKS. There are a half a dozen provisions in this bill which make me hesitate about supporting it. I am fearful that they may bring results which all Senators and the country will greatly regret. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, December 19, 1913, p. 1251.)

I submit to the Senate that the adoption of this method of organizing the board is going to throw a suspicion of political influence around the most important part of the whole system we are establishing. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, December 23, 1913, p. 1507.)

Mr. GALLINGER. That the bill contains a provision that will inflate the currency, possibly to the extent of real danger, has not been denied, but, on the other hand, has been frankly admitted. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, December 19, 1913, p. 1252.)

It is now contended that the pending legislation will relieve the existing industrial disturbance and restore to work the men who have recently lost employment in consequence of a lack of orders on the part of manufacturers. I sincerely wish that that result might follow, but my judgment is that this prediction, like those so confidently made during the discussion of the tariff bill, will fail of fulfillment, and that permanent relief will only come through another revision of the tariff along the lines of adequate protection to the industries and labor of the United States. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, December 19, 1913, p. 1252.)

Mr. NEWLANDS. We can never stop that increase in prices unless we conclude in some way to limit this vast inflation of money; and the way to do it now is not to create new units, new promises to pay, in order to meet emergencies, without also putting in the bill provision for the retirement of those units of money when the emergency is over. I do not believe that this bill is securely guarded in that particular. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, December 19, 1913, p. 1253.)

Mr. SMOOT. This bill, I believe, is but temporary. There are provisions in the bill that I would like to support, but, Mr. President, I can not vote for the bill in its present form. I would not be doing justice to my conscience or to my judgment if I did. I hope the result of the passage of the bill will be all that its friends anticipate for it. I think, Mr. President, that the result will be an inflation of our currency. That may afford temporary relief and tide over our present business depression, but it can only be temporary. I am afraid that it will fail to accomplish in the end what it is contemplated to accomplish. * * * I wish that I could vote for the bill, but I can not. I shall cast my vote against the bill. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, December 19, 1913, p. 1254.)

Mr. BRANDEGEE. The present bill proposes, as the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Bristow] has said, a complicated, top-heavy, widespread, loosely joined structure, framed entirely without any previous experience as a guide, and it is proposed to impose it upon the country, which, as other Senators have said, could easily have gotten along for a few years with a very few simple amendments to the existing system under which we have prospered so long. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, December 19, 1913, p. 1254.)

Mr. SHERMAN. It would take of the deposits from New York City and from the country banks and the reserve cities outside in the State of New York a total of more than \$64,000,000, making a total transfer in the State of New York alone of nearly \$85,000,000; and all this aggregation of banking resources, when collected in these regional banks, would be absolutely subject to the arbitrary power of the Federal

Reserve Board without a limitation as to a time of emergency. The time in which it could be exercised would be unlimited. It would run 12 months in the year and be subject to the same course of distribution shown in the \$46,500,000. Whether any favoritism be shown or not, the truth remains that in distribution it goes to the country and furnishes the banking resources to areas that produce a minimum of crops and money. This is the first net result of the "new freedom" in business. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, December 19, 1913, p. 1292.)

Mr. HALL of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, to say more on the agricultural question than has already been said here would seem almost ridiculous. It is well established and the fact that agriculture is in sad straits has been known for years past. Those who have written the platforms of each political party acknowledge it, and thus there can be no political dissension about any measure to give relief to the agriculturalist. There can be nothing political in the McNary-Haugen bill. I hold that the policy as set out in the preamble is constructive and I am pleased to believe that each Member of this House is honest and earnest in his attitude on the measure.

I think the Congress, the Executive, and all departments of the Nation should seek to stimulate a constructive policy for agriculture as it has for certain industries and finance. It has been said on the floor of this House that in 1927, when a good many farmers have ceased to expect relief of this kind and are spending little time asking for it, that there is a great increase in the ranks of those contending for it, as they hope to make it a factor in a political engagement a year from now. How true that assumption is I can not say. There may be some who, for reasons best known to themselves, would like to make a political issue of it, but I can not see anything political in the proposition.

Not often in this history of agriculture has the index number of wholesale prices in this country exceeded or equaled the index number of all commodities. From 1890 to 1896 the average prices did exceed others about 10 points. This was the period of many troubles and great industrial distress. It was the time of Coxey's army and when the unemployed was known as a "hobo."

I would refer you to the tables submitted by the gentleman from New York [Mr. JACOBSTEIN], which shows the index number of factory labor at 210 while the index of agricultural products are 127. From 1897 to 1899 the excess still averaged 9 points a year; from 1900 to 1908 the annual average excess of all-commodities index over the farm-products index was 6 points; from 1909 to 1913 only twice did the index of farm products exceed the all-commodities index. In other words, in the 24 years from 1890 to 1913, inclusive, only in 1910 and 1912 did wholesale prices of farm products on the average exceed the all-commodities price, and then only 2 points in each year.

During the World War a reversal occurred. For the six-year period from 1914 to 1919 the average annual excess of farm products over all commodities was 11 points. Only in 1916 did all commodities exceed farm products, and then by 4 points. This exception was due no doubt in good part to the injury wrought by the German submarine campaign.

During the postwar deflationary period of four years all commodities averaged 15 points higher than farm products. In other words, in the total period of 34 years there were only 7 during which farm products enjoyed an advantage over all commodities. During 27 years the advantage lay heavily with all commodities, of which farm products constitute less than 27 per cent.

In this connection it is important to remember two things: First, that the all-commodities index number includes farm products, and that if they were eliminated the disadvantageous relation of farm products often would be more pronounced; and second, the index numbers under discussion are based on wholesale prices and include transportation and other charges.

A third point to be remembered is that even when farm products indices show an improved situation in agriculture it may be due to high prices in a few farm industries, and the improvements may not affect farming in general.

Many of those who oppose the McNary-Haugen bill claim that it would increase the cost of living. The brokerage system, the middleman, and distributing system is not what it should be. It should not be put out of business or scrapped, but Congress should give some attention to the practice now in vogue in the distribution of farm products.

The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER] told us the other day of sweet potatoes being sold by his tenants at 75 cents a bushel, and those same potatoes sold to the consumer in New York City at about \$8 a bushel.

A system that will permit of this sort of thing should be inquired into. It should be revamped and required, without

undue waste and at reasonable costs, to perform the services demanded under proper business supervision to give producer and consumer alike a square deal.

We are told that the proposed bill is fundamentally unsound; that it seeks to put the Government in business; that it is unconstitutional; that it is price fixing. From my observation, I find that there is not a single industry in the United States with which the Government does not interfere—sometimes to build up, sometimes to destroy.

The powers of the proposed farm board over agriculture do not approach even the powers of the Federal Reserve Board and its various agencies over business and commerce; and they are insignificant as compared with the authority of the Interstate Commerce Commission over rail transportation. We are maintaining a Shipping Board and an Emergency Fleet Corporation which, in their effect upon privately owned ships, far transcend the powers conferred upon the farm board. We have a Federal Farm Loan Bureau, which was created for the very purpose of competing with private enterprise. Fully half a dozen other instances could be noted.

The purpose of the equalization fee, as I understand it, is to make up an operating fund whereby all producers of a surplus commodity upon which an operating period is fixed by the farm board are required to pay a sum which in the total will pay the losses sustained by the agencies set up by the farm board to buy and sell or store the surplus production in order that it may not destroy domestic prices or prevent orderly and effective marketing. You may call this an equalization fee, an operating charge, an expense item pro rated among the producers, or a tax. It amounts to the same thing. The fund created must bear the cost of transportation, storage, accounting, inspection, and grading, and it represents each producer's investment in the year's carry over of the surplus. The system is in general vogue in the business world everywhere.

As to whether any provision of the act is unconstitutional or not, the courts will decide these questions when occasion demands it. As to whether the plan will work or not, we can best determine by starting it going. The automobile was not developed wholly in the machine shop. The actual working of the machinery in its operation on the road disclosed its weaknesses, and suggested changes to overcome them.

The farmers of the country are anxiously awaiting the action of this Congress. It will mean success or failure to many of them. Renewed ambition and hope if it passes and become a law; disappointment, heartaches, and despair if it fails.

Some of those who suggest that they are qualified to speak, hint that if the bill is passed by the Congress that the President will not sign it; that he will veto it; that the passage of the bill would embarrass the administration, and so forth. I do not believe that sort of talk. I do not believe the President would be embarrassed in the least; but, on the other hand, would heave a sigh of relief to know that Congress after straining at the job for the past six years, had at least enacted something worth while; had redeemed the pledges made to the people by his political party and that the membership could now turn their attention to other important matters of legislation. I say in all earnestness that I think the President will sign the bill. That while there may be some parts of it not just as he would like them, his heart and sympathy goes out to the men, women, and children on American farms and he is not going to quibble over details. Difficulties will be overcome and adjusted as they are discovered.

Agriculture has contributed more to America's industry and greatness than any other single factor. We approached a point some years ago when the growth and momentum of factory and industrial developments were so great as to leave agriculture at a great disadvantage in the economic structure, and this disadvantage has continued to increase until we find the American farmer a mere serf upon the land and the Nation must step in and give substantial aid in the way of such legislation as is proposed under this McNary-Haugen bill, just as from 1789 to this day agriculture has contributed to and nurtured industry. Definite, constructive policies, ably administered, looking a long way ahead into the future, must be set up by the Government if agriculture is to be saved and the men, women, and children on our farms are to prosper to enjoy the fruits of their labors and the standard of American home life be maintained.

I am in full accord with the provisions of this means. The Legislative Assembly of North Dakota passed a concurrent resolution indorsing the McNary-Haugen bill, and the North Dakota Press Association and many other associations representing farmers, newspaper men, bankers, and civic organizations generally favor the enactment of some such legislation.

AGRICULTURE

Mr. BRIGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting a speech made by myself.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BRIGHAM. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following address made by me before the Association of Commissioners of Agriculture at Chicago on November 30, 1926:

SURPLUSES: A PROBLEM OF ADJUSTMENT OF SUPPLY TO DEMAND

Mr. BRIGHAM. The agricultural situation of the crop year 1925-26 is made clear in the statement recently issued by the National Industrial Conference Board. According to this analysis, the average return for labor and management applied to farms by their operators amounted to \$679 per operator for the year. In this amount credit is given the farm for the food, fuel, and shelter which is supplied. In the case of farm owners, after allowing a return of 5½ per cent on their investment, the remaining income for labor and management was but \$440 per farm owner. This, the board states, is less than a third of the average annual earnings per worker of other occupational groups.

This condition of the agricultural industry has existed now for several years, until it has become the concern of all classes of people, because, apart from all considerations of sympathy, it is now generally recognized that a high standard of living for all the people is not only desirable but is of fundamental importance to the business prosperity of the country.

What is the cause of this situation? What is the remedy? These are questions of such vital importance to our general welfare that they have caused almost endless debate in the meetings of farmers, in the gatherings of business men, and in the Congress of the United States, where the opinions of every section of the country are reflected.

Many of the remedies suggested are concerned with what the Government ought to do to relieve agriculture of burdensome surpluses. I come to you as one who believes that the troubles of the agricultural industry are based upon fundamental economic causes which can best be corrected by farmers themselves with the guidance rather than the financial help of governmental agencies.

PROGRESS OF AGRICULTURE

In making an inquiry into the cause of the present troubles of the farming industry let us consider, briefly, some changes which have occurred. In 1790 the First Census of the United States was taken. It showed a population of less than 4,000,000 persons. It is estimated that 95 per cent of them were engaged in the pursuit of agriculture. Even when allowance is made for the exports of those days, it is evident that the farmer of that early time produced largely to supply the needs of his own family. McMaster, in his history of the people of the United States, quotes the following statement from a farmer in 1787:

"At this time my farm gave me and my whole family a good living on the produce of it, and left me, one year with another, one hundred and fifty silver dollars, for I never spent more than \$10 a year, which was for salt, nails, and the like."

The census of 1920, the Fourteenth Census, shows that in round numbers 11,000,000 persons were engaged in agriculture, or only 26 per cent of the gainfully employed persons in the United States. These 11,000,000 workers in agriculture were not only producing most of the foodstuffs and clothing material for 105,000,000 people here at home, but exports sufficient to feed more than 20,000,000 people abroad. Therefore, in a period of 13 decades agriculture had advanced from a position where nearly all the workers of the Nation were employed raising crops and animals to feed and clothe themselves and families to a point where a worker in agriculture was feeding himself and 10 others. This period not only shows a remarkable progress in the agricultural production per worker, but it also marks great progress in the transition of agriculture from the primitive stage of producing for the family to the commercial stage of producing for the market, which transition has brought many benefits but has also opened a veritable Pandora's box of troubles which the primitive farmer of 1790 knew not of.

In the commercial stage of agriculture we must apply to the farm the same standards of measurement that we apply to other industries and we must judge the farmer's well-being, not by the abundance of supplies he has in his possession but by the money which these supplies can command in exchange. The National Industrial Conference Board's report from which I have quoted deals with agriculture from this point of view and shows that measured from the standard of return on invested capital and reward for time employed in labor, agriculture is not a good business—that progress on the business side of agriculture has not kept pace with the remarkable progress on the production side.

The farm family to-day needs and will not be satisfied without an income equal to that enjoyed by other classes of people. The farm

family demands a financial condition which will enable it to obtain those investments, the telephone, the automobile, the radio, etc., which have done so much to relieve the isolation of rural life. The farm family will not be denied its right to those improvements in living conditions which are freely accorded by society to all classes. But taking precedence of the farm family's demand for comforts and even decencies of life, freely accorded other classes, is the tax levy which has increased enormously in the last 10 years and must be met by cash payments. When such a situation as this confronts over one-fourth of our working population have we not reached the point where agriculture must be helped to become a good business as judged by the standards of the business world?

WHAT CAN BE DONE TO MAKE AGRICULTURE A GOOD BUSINESS?

It is a fundamental concept of economics that utility and scarcity are the factors which give value to a thing. The air we breathe has utility, but it is so plentiful that we do not have to put forth any effort or labor to obtain what we need. On the other hand, bread is not only a utility but it is relatively scarce. Therefore we have to devote time and labor to the production of breadstuffs, labor and machinery to the transportation and preparation of these breadstuffs from the fields where they are produced to our tables, and we must give something valuable in exchange for the capital and labor employed in this production. Suppose the owners and controllers of lands throughout the world should increase their acreage in wheat to the limit of possibility; suppose milling and baking facilities should be correspondingly increased, and as a result twice as many loaves of bread should be offered in our markets. Bread would then become so plentiful that it would be deprived of its element of scarcity, and its exchange value—its ability to command other commodities—would fall to almost nothing. Low price, meaning low exchange value, is but the inevitable economic penalty paid by an industry for failure to properly proportion supply to needs. It is the natural process by which there is brought about that adjustment in the employment of the world's labor and capital which will best supply the world's needs.

If we study any industry which is successful in the business sense we find that that industry has first of all so adjusted its production to the demand for its goods that the price or exchange value of its product is maintained at a level which will enable that industry to pay the costs of production and a profit.

Effort is now being made by many industrial interests to avoid the dislocation incident to the ups and downs, the alternating booms and depressions, of the business cycle by keeping in such close touch with production and consumption that business will not overextend itself and suffer a violent depression but will have a constant flow of moderate prosperity. This same adjustment, more difficult of attainment for agriculture, is nevertheless an indispensable condition of business success in agriculture. The farmer who produced for his own use was one of the most independent of men in that he had to consider only the desires and needs of his own family while the modern farmer, who would achieve business success, must not only turn out a product such as meets the requirements of the consumer but must also work in conjunction with his fellow farmers to the end that the combined product shall neither permanently nor for long periods exceed a consumer demand for that product which will yield a profitable return. The farmer's ability to create exchange-value wealth depends absolutely upon such adjustment of supply to demand.

POLICIES NEED REVISION

Our conception of agriculture, which is responsible for our policies, needs revision if agriculture is to be made a good business. When the farm family was a self-sufficient unit it became a fixed idea that we could not have too many farms or too many farmers, and our Federal Government encouraged the rapid settlement of our public domain first by sale to settlers at a low price and later by gift to those who would become cultivators. This policy led to a rapid extension of our farm area. In the years from 1870-1880 we added to our cultivated area 297,000 square miles, a territory equal in extent to Great Britain and France combined.

The result was the disturbance of the farming industry in the older section of the United States and in the whole world. The present depression is less severe than that suffered by eastern farmers from 1870 to 1900. Still believing that there could not be too many farms or too many farmers, agriculture was not given time to recover from the effects of free land distribution before the Federal Government began a program of reclamation of waste lands by irrigation. According to a statement furnished me by the Secretary of the Interior, as of June 30, 1926, the Federal Government had under irrigation on its various projects 1,320,300 acres of land, while preparations are already made to supply water for nearly 500,000 acres additional. The Government has expended in reclaiming this land a total of nearly \$162,000,000, or \$87.50 per acre. According to the 1923 Yearbook of the United States Department of Agriculture the exemption of settlers from interest on construction costs has been estimated at approximately \$70,000,000, which is referred to in the Yearbook article as an indirect subsidy to settlers on these projects. The first session of the Sixty-ninth Congress remitted over \$14,000,000 of charges on irrigation projects.

Following the same policies as the Federal Government, the States have entered into land-settlement activities of a similar nature. Many States have immigration departments for the purpose of encouraging the movement of settlers to new and cut-over lands. The Federal and State activities have in turn been supplemented by the work of chambers of commerce, bankers, real-estate operators, and other private agencies interested in the development of particular regions. As a result of such policies agriculture is a highly competitive industry, production is beyond consumer needs, and in consequence small return is received.

For more than half a century our Federal and State Governments have maintained experiment stations to investigate the problems of plant and animal growth and colleges to instruct the youth of the land in the science and art of agriculture. The Federal Government has maintained a great Department of Agriculture, the greatest Department of Agriculture in the world, and the several States have also their departments for the promotion of agriculture. Until very recently the work of these various agencies centered almost entirely upon the problems of greater production without relation to the business problems of the farm. A few years ago the United States Department of Agriculture published a bulletin entitled "An Example of Model Farming." The farm in question consisted of 15 acres of land which had been developed to the point of raising the roughage for 30 head of stock, 17 of which were cows in milk. A near-by institution purchased all the milk at 6¼ cents per quart. Under the circumstances the enterprise was a financial success. At the time this bulletin was issued I figured over the production costs of this so-called model farm and found that if I had done the very same thing in the market available to me, which at the time paid 3 cents per quart, bankruptcy would soon have followed. To-day if such a bulletin were issued I should expect the Bureau of Agricultural Economics to have a hand in its preparation and to point out that while this farm was a model from the point of view of great production on a small area, its business success was made possible only by the market which paid twice the price available to the ordinary dairyman.

The opening of new lands, irrigation of waste lands, the work of all the agencies solving the problems of production have been good work, but as conditions change our policies must be changed. Solution of the business problems of agriculture now need our closest attention. These problems demand not only educational work which will lead to a more efficient and lower cost production but also educational work which will lead to a more efficient and more economical system of marketing and recognition of the fact that in the future lands should be developed only as needs require.

EFFECT OF THE WORLD WAR

The World War introduced into agriculture, just as it did into nearly all industries, many disturbing elements. The outbreak of the war found us in a period of declining exports of farm products. However, conditions in Europe soon created a demand which absorbed the production of our farms at prices greatly in excess of the normal. These prices were so high that the owners of the better farms had left after paying the expenses of production a large surplus of cash return. Farmers and business men mistook what was an abnormal condition growing out of the war for a permanent condition of agricultural prosperity, and there resulted in many sections of our country a great land boom. For instance, the average value of land and buildings per acre of Iowa farms increased from \$96 per acre in 1910 to \$229.09 per acre in 1920. This difference of \$133.09 per acre largely added by the war boom to Iowa land means the addition of more than four and a quarter billions of dollars to the capitalization of the lands of the State, and it also means on the basis of a 5¼ per cent on this capitalization the addition of approximately 20 cents per bushel to the cost of growing corn in that State. Land booms in agriculture, like booms in other classes of real estate, bring calamitous consequences if they overreach themselves, and while our sympathy must go out to those who purchased Corn Belt land at high prices, to those who loaned them the money with which to buy, and to those who once inventoried their acres at the increased figure, yet there is no feasible remedy for the losses and deflations which have come upon them except to take their losses or get a direct national subsidy in such form that it will not stimulate greater production. Agriculture will never be a good business in any region on the basis of inflated land values.

War demand finally came to an end. It has been estimated that the World War cost a total of \$350,000,000,000, a sum equal to the total wealth of this country. Such a gigantic drain of the world's capital must sooner or later reflect upon the consuming power of the world's population. The year 1920 marked the beginning of the decline in the prices of farm products.

Four years after the armistice a British food expert, in making a summary of European food conditions, said:

"This bare summary of the position of the most important foodstuffs shows clearly enough that the standard of living in the cities of Europe is still appreciably below the pre-war figure."

Yet, in the face of the impoverished condition of our customers, our acreage involved in farm products for export even increased over that

employed for the war-time demand. Our total output of the cereal grains was greater in 1925 than for any of the war years except 1915. The President in his speech here in Chicago two years ago said: "The sound remedy is to reduce production." Can anyone say, in view of the real situation, that his advice was not sound?

PROSPERITY THROUGH CONGRESSIONAL ACTION

Yet there is in many sections of the United States an insistent demand that the Congress of the United States enact a law calculated to make agriculture a good business by storing and exporting surpluses of farm products and thereby relieving the domestic market of their burden. Some favor doing this at the expense of the Treasury of the United States—that is, at the expense of all the people; others would make a levy upon farm products to reimburse the Treasury and thereby throw the expense upon the farmers themselves.

The proposals made really mean that demand is made upon the Congress of the United States to pass a law which will exempt agriculture from the economic penalties of overproducing. If agriculture is overproducing at present prices, what will happen if Congress does enter upon a policy of raising prices. Thirty-seven million acres devoted to cotton in 1923, with a moderate crop, produced in round numbers 10,000,000 bales of cotton, which brought farmers an average price of 31 cents per pound, and stocks on hand were worked off. From 1923 on we had a progressive increase in our cotton acreage and larger yields. Our 1925 acreage was larger than that of 1923 by nearly 9,000,000 acres. Prices were practically cut in two and over 5,000,000 bales were carried over to compete with this crop. In 1926 we again added over a million acres to our cotton acreage. The price is now ruinously low to producers, and there is prospect of a carry over of 7,500,000 bales to conflict with the crop of 1927. Cotton can be carried for many years and our production can be greatly extended if the Government can make cotton growing profitable for everybody who wants to go into the business of growing it. But is it policy to employ capital and labor in growing cotton and in storing a supply of it far beyond the world's needs for years to come? We might just as well face now the problem of adjusting our supply of cotton to the demand as to wait until we have overhanging the industry several years' supply in storage.

The legislation proposed would increase rather than lessen the evil of overproduction. Furthermore, it is based upon the fallacious notion that somewhere in the world there exists a demand for any surpluses of agricultural products we may create. Such is far from being the fact. The surplus of most farm products is now world-wide. Other nations are just as anxious as we are to place their agriculture upon a prosperous basis, and it is too much for us to expect that they will submit to having their own producers subjected to the dumping of our surpluses upon their markets, particularly if this is done through direct Government intervention.

Before making the prosperity of their business contingent upon the uncertainties of political action, should not farmers themselves pause and consider what this would mean. Conditions are right now for a wave of sympathetic interest in agriculture on the part of all classes of people. We are in a period of industrial prosperity which has brought about general employment of labor at high prices. The farmer as the under dog to-day, let us assume, can receive sufficient consideration from Congress so that one of the export plans can be passed and become a law. Let us assume that the plan works and results in higher prices being paid by the American consumer for his food than is paid for that same food sold in other markets. Let us assume that in a short time we have an industrial depression with consequent unemployment. Let us remember that representation in Congress in the lower House is in proportion to population and the President and the Senators are elected by popular vote. Let us remember, also, that only 26 per cent of the gainfully employed persons are engaged in agriculture. Can we conclude, in view of this situation, that the prospect for farm relief through political action has anything to recommend it from the standpoint of stability or permanency?

Do farmers themselves want fastened upon the agriculture of this country a policy of governmental price control which, if it works to raise prices in the interest of producers, may at some future time operate to lower prices in the interest of consumers? The Yearbook of the United States Department of Agriculture for 1923 estimated the average area from 1914-1922 devoted to crops for direct and indirect export involved a total of 61,000,000 acres of crop land. The estimate is made also that if this area were devoted to production for our own use, we could maintain an increase of population of 21,000,000 persons. Our own population is increasing at the rate of 1,500,000 persons a year. Then in 14 years on the present basis of increase in population our cultivated land area held at its present acreage, and without further artificial stimulation of production, will be needed to supply our own people. When that time comes, and it will come before 14 years, because we shall always continue to export commodities in the production of which we have a special advantage, such as cotton and hog products, what will happen if American agriculture has fastened upon itself a policy of Government price control which may so easily be made to work to the disadvantage of the producer?

It is urged that Government action to raise the price of farm products of which we have an exportable surplus would only be doing justice in making the tariff effective for agriculture. Our Government from its very beginning has from time to time for one reason or another levied duties on certain articles. The avowed purpose has generally been to protect commodities produced within the country from the competition of similar commodities of foreign production. The idea that the Government should take action to raise the domestic price above the world price by the amount of the duty is a new departure in tariff legislation. Common justice would demand that the Government, if it is to embark upon this new policy, should not confine it to a few farm products, but should extend it to all farm products. Agriculture is to-day so interdependent that the products which the farmers of one region sell in the market become the articles of purchase and the raw materials of the farmers of other regions. If the Government is to take action to raise the price of bread and meat and grains which the dairymen, the poultry raisers, the potato growers, and general farmers of the East must buy, then action must also be taken to raise the prices of their products. If the tariff is to be made effective for agriculture, must it not in all fairness be made effective for manufactured products as well?

In view of all these considerations, I am confident time will reveal that the real friends of American agriculture are those who in this crisis resisted a price-fixing policy on the part of the Government.

The Government of the United States should, in my opinion, concern itself with policies which will lead to the prosperity and well-being of all its people. Farmers comprise a very substantial proportion of the Nation's workers. The products which they turn into the channels of trade comprise not only a large part of the Nation's commerce but supply the food which is a vital necessity for all the people. It is essential from the standpoint of national well-being and national self-sufficiency that the farming industry should be on a sound and enduring basis. All those who are studying the problems of agriculture are in accord upon this. All are sincerely endeavoring to bring about those changes which are for its permanent betterment. But the desired end can not be obtained by adopting remedies which may relieve the distress of the moment only to bring in their wake evils which will do permanent harm. Better economic leadership from the Department of Agriculture, both State and national, and from the institutions of learning; better organizations of farmers for the purpose of applying more efficient business methods to the industry; favorable laws for the regulation of trade practices and the provision of credit facilities to meet the needs of agriculture; these are not temporary but permanent reforms, which will place the farming industry upon a profitable basis.

ADDRESS OF FORMER GOVERNOR ALF TAYLOR, OF TENNESSEE

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

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. REECE. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Ex-Governor Alf Taylor, before the Tennessee Society of St. Louis, January 8, 1927, Jackson Day:

GREATNESS AND THE WORLD'S GREAT MEN

I have seen every President of the United States from Abraham Lincoln to Calvin Coolidge; have had the privilege of knowing some of them personally, namely: Andrew Johnson, Rutherford B. Hayes, James A. Garfield, Benjamin Harrison, Grover Cleveland, William McKinley, Theodore Roosevelt, and Warren G. Harding. These were all great, good men; each upheld the right as he was given to see the right; each performed his task with fidelity and honor, and if they could be with us in the flesh this evening they would, with one voice, coincide with me in my estimate of the first illustrious President on the list I have mentioned. If you were to ask me to point out to you the greatest man I ever saw, without a moment's hesitation I would point to Abraham Lincoln as the greatest man I ever looked in the face. His was the largest task of any of them. God raised him up to fit it and endowed him with wisdom to perform it. Henry Watterson, of the Courier-Journal, said he was "inspired of God." Woodrow Wilson, accepting the place of his birth as a national shrine, said: "Lincoln and Washington were typical Americans in the use they made of their genius; but there will be few such men at best, and we will not look into the mystery of how and why they come. We will only keep the door open for them, always, and hearty welcome—after we have recognized them." These words from the lips of illustrious political opponents, are eulogies within themselves, equal to any eulogy ever pronounced by the most ardent political friend.

He loved peace and hated war. He tried with all his might to avert the fraternal conflict. He negotiated a conference between himself and the Confederate authorities at Hampton Roads and, according to those who kept in touch with inside events at the time, he went so far as to say to Alexander H. Stephens, representing the Confederacy, "Let me

write one word at the top of the sheet of paper you hold in your hand and you may write the rest of the agreement." Mr. Stephens inquired as to the word he had in mind; Mr. Lincoln replied that the word was "Union." Mr. Stephens declined the proposition on the ground that to sign such an agreement would be transcending his authority. Thereupon the conference ended, and then it was that the lowering clouds of war let loose afresh their thunderbolts of destruction and death. I saw Mr. Lincoln on three occasions at the closing and after the close of the struggle. As a boy in my early teens, in company with a Congressman, I saw him in the White House afterwards. I heard him speak at Philadelphia, and a short time subsequently I saw him dead, when his body was lying in state in old Independence Hall. I never have forgotten, nor will I ever forget, a statement I heard him make in the conversation at the White House. The Congressman asked for the release of a Confederate brigadier general, a prisoner of war at Fortress Monroe, who had saved his life during the Civil War. Without the return of a word Mr. Lincoln wrote an order to the Secretary of War for the release of the general, and as he handed it to the Congressman he said: "Some of us may never be able to forget, but all of us must forgive and return to the peaceful walks of life and build up the waste places."

When he fell a victim of the assassin's bullet the Nation was bereft of an ideal President, and the South lost its best friend at a time it most needed a friend. If he had lived, I undertake to say that complete reconciliation would have taken place between the sections before the expiration of his second term, and the country would have escaped the untold bitterness and prejudice engendered during the prolonged period of reconstruction. Reconciliation, rehabilitation, the return of good will and friendly intercourse among the people of all sections was the burden of his great soul.

His life and career is, ought to be, and doubtless will be a source of inspiration to the coming generations of men everywhere. His life is an example illustrative of the fact that under our system the road that leads to eminence and success is open and free to everyone. There are no toll gates and poverty is no bar! Character, capacity, faithfulness—the Jeffersonian standard—constitute the only passport, and opportunities are ever present.

It seems that most men and women, like diamonds in the rough or precious metal in the quartz, must be ground and polished on the hard, sharp grit of evil fortune or crushed to powder under its merciless pestles and fused in its white-hot fires before they may shine with the jewels' ray or the serene lustre of the virgin gold. Most of the gems that adorn human character are crystallized in the fiery crucibles of adversity! Our history is full of examples. For instance, Andrew Jackson was a poor boy, self-dependent, self-educated, and entirely self-made. Benjamin Franklin was once a typesetter in Boston and subsequently in the city of Philadelphia. Patrick Henry was a day laborer in Hanover County, Va. James A. Garfield was once a mule driver on the towpath of a canal. Andrew Johnson was a poor orphan boy, bound out to a tailor by trade and never having gone to a school a single day in his life, learned his letters between stitches while at work on the tailor's bench. His wife taught him to read. He filled every position known to our political system, from town councilman to President of the United States, and died a United States Senator.

Abraham Lincoln was poorest of them all, and had smaller advantages than any of them. Born as lowly as the Babe of Bethlehem in a log hut in Kentucky, reared to manhood in it and similar huts in Indiana and Illinois, inured to every hardship known to squalid poverty; having to perform every character of drudgery and hard work incident to life in the wilderness, clearing ground for the cultivation of crops and splitting the rails to fence it; working as a farm hand in farming time and as a boat hand at odd times; handling heavy freights on the Sangamon and Mississippi Rivers; finally securing a job as a sort of handy man and clerk in a village store, doing all the drudgery, weighing up and storing away every kind of produce given in exchange for goods; at the same time reading and studying borrowed books, as he had been doing theretofore, in the evenings by the moonlight or by pine-torch light in midnight darkness; at length entering the community debating society and never failing to attend its meeting and to participate in its debates, he, at last, found himself! He developed rapidly into the clearest-headed, best-informed, and most forceful debater of the organization, attracting immediate local attention, and becoming the most popular figure about New Salem. He went through these early struggles without a word of complaint, and came out of them all a physical and intellectual giant, and, above all, "the noblest work of God, an honest man." Thus, self-supported, self-educated, and entering young manhood with nothing but brain and muscle to back him, he finally concluded to be a lawyer. Training himself for that profession by means of borrowed law books, he succeeded in procuring license and entered the practice, and continued to practice successfully for a quarter of a century. Popular clamor drew him into politics and he entered that field, serving four terms in the Legislature of Illinois and one term in Congress, becoming thereafter a candidate for United States Senator against Stephen A. Douglas. His masterly handling of the issues in his joint debates with Douglas attracted attention nation-wide and

made him so exceedingly popular in Illinois that at the election he received a majority of the popular vote of 4,000. But the legislature at that time elected Senators, and Mr. Douglas was elected.

Upon the assembling of the convention of the new party Mr. Lincoln was nominated for President, and was elected in the year of Our Lord 1860. He was overwhelmingly reelected in 1864 and was inaugurated for a second term.

There are two historic figures that measure up to my highest ideal of greatness as applied to men. One of them is Abraham Lincoln and the other is Andrew Jackson. They were alike, at least, in one supremely important respect—they were alike in their devotion to the American Union! Jackson put a quietus upon the nullification movement in his day when he swore "By the Eternal, the Union must and shall be preserved." It fell to the lot of Lincoln to preserve it in his day, thus settling the question for all time!

We can not look upward from the foot of a towering peak and see its summit or receive a just impression of its grandeur; no more can we stand under the shadow of greatness and behold its pinnacle or be awed by its majesty. But, as in the one case, we must contemplate the mountain from a distance of space and determine its class by comparison with its fellows in the range; so, in the other, we must view and estimate great men and their actions in a perspective projected by distance of time. In order to form a just judgment, we must view them against the background of a calm, historic horizon, clarified of all prejudice and the fogs and mists of controversy, contrasting them with other altitudes in the mountain chain of human greatness. To-day we look backward, in the case of Andrew Jackson, through a perspective of a century, and, in the case of Abraham Lincoln, through a perspective of three-score years, and we see no summit which overshadows their fame—and few which rise to its level; and the lengthening of the perspectives through long stretches of the coming centuries will only add luster to their achievements and glory to their immortal names.

IMPORTATION OF MILK AND CREAM INTO THE UNITED STATES

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 11768) to regulate the importation of milk and cream into the United States.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 11768. Is there objection?

Mr. BLACK of New York. I object.

THE PUBLIC-BUILDING SITUATION

Mr. BOX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in reference to public buildings.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD on public buildings. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOX. Mr. Speaker, because I know that many of my constituents are interested in the efforts which have been made to procure the erection of Federal post-office buildings at each of several needy points within the district, and because it is my duty to advise the people I represent about my own action, the situation and prospects, I make this statement.

I first came to Congress in 1919. From 1913, six years before I came, until 1926, seven years after I came, no bill or plan for supplying the needed post-office buildings throughout the country was adopted.

Beginning with the first session of the Sixty-sixth Congress, the first to which I was elected, with the introduction of bills, urging action on them by the committee having jurisdiction of them, and by every other proper procedure known to me, I diligently sought relief for the most needy points within the district.

In 1926, last year, Congress virtually took from itself the power to say what towns should have public buildings and passed that power to a committee composed of representatives of the Treasury and Post Office Departments. That was a thoroughly unsound innovation, taking this function from the authority which had exercised it since the establishment of the Government and placing it in the executive department and more or less beyond the control of the elected Representatives and Senators. I opposed and voted against that measure so long as it was open and until the law was passed and approved by the President.

By that act this commission was directed to make a survey of the country and report where public buildings should be erected and the amounts to be expended. Of the towns in the United States having no Federal post-office buildings, there were and are 858 towns having annual postal receipts of over \$20,000, and about 1,500 towns having annual postal receipts of between \$10,000 and \$20,000, making about 2,358 towns in these classes with no post-office buildings. In addition there are several

hundred larger cities and towns which have so outgrown their Federal buildings as to make them seriously inadequate.

This survey resulted in a report recommending the improvement or erection of about 200 buildings during the next six years out of more than 2,350 towns covered by the survey. A further report added other towns.

The first report of this survey recommends some additional buildings, or enlargements or improvement of buildings, in eight Texas cities and two new buildings for Texas towns having none. The additional report, made later, covered other points, a few of which are in Texas. The public-building needs of several Texas congressional districts, and probably as many as 100 congressional districts throughout the Nation, were left without mention or the promise of public-building relief by both the original and supplemental reports mentioned, leaving these several Texas districts and some 100 districts throughout the Nation with no prospect for a building under this plan, which is supposed to operate during the next five or six years. Our congressional district is one of those listed as probably early beneficiaries under this building plan.

The existing Federal building at Beaumont, which has the United States court and attendant officers, a customs office, prohibition-enforcement forces, a post office for a growing city of above 50,000 people, and other official Federal activities, was found to contain only about one-fourth of the space it needs for these activities and was listed to receive a minimum of \$220,000 for enlargements during this building period, which amount is said to be not nearly sufficient for its needs. Beaumont's needs will be at least partially provided for under this program. I regret that this will not be done this year, but not every point could be first on the program. The failure of the Senate to pass the bill appropriating the money intended for use in starting this program leaves all points without even the promise of a beginning this year, so far as can be ascertained at this closing moment of the session of Congress.

Beaumont, Lufkin, Jacksonville, and Center have been presented by me, by bills regularly introduced and otherwise, as points within our congressional district in present need of Federal buildings. The one situation at Beaumont, mentioned above, is the only one in our district which has the prospect of securing relief under this plan. For 1925 Beaumont's post-office receipts were \$222,154, Lufkin's post-office receipts were \$30,926, the receipts of the Jacksonville post office for 1925 were \$29,503, and Center's postal receipts for the same year were \$12,086.

Why is Beaumont listed for an insufficient amount? Why is nothing to be done for Beaumont during the next fiscal year, and why have Lufkin, Jacksonville, and Center been so far listed for nothing? Intelligent citizens are entitled to an answer to these questions from one to whose hands they have committed their interests. To talk about a situation or a problem without knowing the facts is not intelligent. Most of the people of the four great communities mentioned are both intelligent and fair. They do not wish to speak foolishly nor to judge unfairly. I submit the following facts as an answer to the legitimate questions stated:

The actual public interests of these communities have not been to any extent neglected by me. No chance to get their needs considered by any one who had power to act has been ignored.

The results which we have obtained in getting our district listed for a substantial amount places it among the districts which get the promise of a measure of early relief. Ours is one of the fortunate districts, while there are many others entirely left out of the prospect of receiving a building or an addition to one, so far as is shown by the reports of this survey.

The chief difficulty grows out of the fact that there are more than 2,300 requests for buildings or enlargements, while the administration and Congress do not feel justified in spending the \$400,000,000 to \$600,000,000 for new buildings outside the District of Columbia which are demanded. Many cities in other States and in Texas, which have a very much larger volume of postal business than either Lufkin, Jacksonville, or Center, have no buildings. Some of them have ten times as much postal business as the largest of these three towns of Lufkin, Jacksonville, and Center.

In this connection I use the receipts of 1925 because the late survey and reports were based on them.

The cities having no buildings which have more than ten times the annual post receipts of the largest of our points having none are: Jamaica, N. Y.; Flushing, N. Y.; Long Beach, Calif., and Warren Pa. Each of these cities has annual postal receipts of over \$400,000 and has no public building.

All of the towns in the above list have annual postal receipts something like twice as great as Beaumont, yet none of the

towns in this list have Federal buildings. Beaumont has an insufficient one and is in line to get an enlargement under this building plan.

Besides the above there are some 11 cities which have no Federal buildings which have annual postal receipts of more than five times the receipts of our largest town having none. They are Garden City, N. Y.; Passaic, N. J.; Staten Island, N. Y.; Tyrone, Pa.; Salem, Mass.; Glendale, Calif.; Endicott, N. Y.; Union City, N. J.; Bloomfield, N. J.; Dunellen, N. J.; and Framingham, Mass.

Each of these has annual receipts of from \$200,000 to \$400,000 and has no Federal building.

In addition to the group of cities first above mentioned, each of which had postal receipts in 1925 of over \$400,000 and had no post-office building, all of the 11 cities named in the last above given list are in the same class with Beaumont; that is, they have annual post-office receipts ranging from \$200,000 to \$400,000 per year. They have no Federal buildings at all. Beaumont, whose postal receipts place it among the smaller of this latter class of cities, has an inadequate building and is listed for its much-needed enlargement.

Besides the above there are some 19 cities having no Federal buildings which have annual post-office receipts some three to six times the receipts of our largest town having none. They are Mount Morris, Ill.; Dearborn, Mich.; Rutherford, N. J.; White Plains, N. Y.; Santa Monica, Calif.; Spencer, Ind.; Santa Anna, Calif.; Uniontown, Pa.; West New York, N. J.; Far Rockaway, N. Y.; Daytona Beach, Fla.; San Bernardino, Calif.; National Stock Yards, Ill.; New Kensington, Pa.; South Norwalk, Conn.; Arlington, N. J.; Marshall, Mich.; Huntington Park, Calif.; and Troy, Ohio.

Each of these towns has annual postal receipts of from \$100,000 to \$200,000 and has no building.

Besides the above I name nine of the many cities having no Federal buildings which have annual postal receipts of more than twice those of our largest town having none. They are Clearfield, Pa.; St. Joseph, Mich.; Princeton, N. J.; Barberton, Ohio; Dansville, N. Y.; Modesto, Calif.; Port Chester, N. Y.; Newton, Iowa; and Paradise, Pa.

Each of these has annual postal receipts of from \$90,000 to \$100,000 and has no public building.

In addition to the above, I name 11 other cities without public buildings which have annual postal receipts at least twice as large as the receipts of our largest city having none. They are Ardmore, Pa.; Greenville, Pa.; Gardner, Mass.; Sturgis, Mich.; Palmer, Mass.; Monticello, Ill.; Red Bank, N. J.; South Orange, N. J.; Tonawanda, N. Y.; Adams, N. Y.; and Painsville, Ohio.

Each of these cities has annual postal receipts of from \$80,000 to \$90,000, and has no public building.

Still staying within the class of cities which have no Federal buildings and have annual postal receipts at least twice as great as those of our largest city having no building, I name 22 others, which are South St. Paul, Minn.; Pukwana, S. Dak.; Norwalk, Conn.; Alhambra, Calif.; Saginaw West Side, Mich.; Ponca City, Okla.; Summit, N. J.; Bristol, Va.; Gallon, Ohio; Palo Alto, Calif.; Pomona, Calif.; Leroy, N. Y.; Jeannette, Pa.; Phillipsburg, N. J.; Sarasota, Fla.; Kent, Ohio; Vallejo, Calif.; Woodsboro, Md.; Wildwood, N. J.; Hempstead, N. Y.; Petaluma, Calif.; and Oneida, N. Y.

Each of these cities has annual postal receipts of from \$70,000 to \$80,000, and has no public building.

Continuing to name cities which have no Federal buildings but which have annual post-office receipts vastly in excess of the largest of our cities having no Federal building, I designate 20 additional ones, which are Whittier, Calif.; Fort Lauderdale, Fla.; Rahway, N. J.; Dunkirk, N. Y.; Tarrytown, N. Y.; Fort Myers, Fla.; Ocean City, N. J.; Englewood, N. J.; Iron Mountain, Mich.; Canajoharie, N. Y.; Ilion, N. Y.; Ridgewood, N. J.; Ossining, N. Y.; Palmyra, N. Y.; Norwich, N. Y.; Clearwater, Fla.; Richmond, Calif.; Redlands, Calif.; Brandenton, Fla.; and Andover, Mass.

Each of these cities has annual postal receipts of \$60,000 to \$70,000 and has no public building.

Continuing to deal with cities which have no Federal buildings and have annual postal receipts enormously larger than the largest of our cities having none, there are 47 towns in the United States, each having postal receipts of \$50,000 to \$60,000 annually, having no Federal buildings. I will furnish a list of them to any citizen requesting it.

In order that citizens of Lufkin, Jacksonville, and Center may know whether or not either of them is in the class of the cities of the largest postal receipts with no Federal buildings, I respectfully advise that in addition to all the long list mentioned above there are 88 towns in the United States having annual postal receipts of \$40,000 to \$50,000 which have no public buildings.

Among those having receipts of more than \$40,000 which have no public buildings and get no present relief are four Texas towns, namely, Mexia, with postal receipts for 1925 of \$46,610, and for 1926 of \$47,812; Plainview, with postal receipts for 1925 of \$45,281, and for 1926 of \$51,539; Sweet Water, with postal receipts for 1925 of \$45,098, and for 1926 of \$50,414; and Breckenridge, with postal receipts for 1925 of \$42,557, and for 1926 of \$50,165. Mexia and Sweet Water are listed in the present six-year building plan for relief sometime during the period. All of the towns referred to in the preceding paragraphs have a larger postal business than any of the three towns of our district which receive no relief. I will send the list of these 88 towns to any citizen who wants it.

Besides the hundreds of cities which have no Federal buildings and which have annual post-office receipts larger than the largest of our cities having no building, with great respect I advise my interested constituents that there are 153 towns in the United States which have no public buildings having in 1925 annual postal receipts of from \$30,000 to \$40,000. Among these are four Texas towns, namely, Ranger, Lufkin, Taylor, and Electra. Taylor has larger receipts than the largest of our towns which have no Federal building and is listed for relief during the next six years. It will be noted that after coming down the list, past hundreds of places of much larger postal receipts during 1925 which have no Federal buildings, we now reach Lufkin. I will gladly furnish a list of these 153 towns of this class to any interested citizen.

There are 425 towns in the United States having no public buildings which in 1925 had annual postal receipts of from \$20,000 to \$30,000, which get no recommendations under this plan. Among them are the following Texas towns: Harlingen, Quanah, Childress, Eastland, Jacksonville, Cisco, San Benito, Kingsville, Lamesa, Kerrville, Big Springs, McAllen, and Coleman. Jacksonville and perhaps other towns named in this list joined the class of those having postal receipts of more than \$30,000 during 1926.

Let no citizen of Lufkin, Jacksonville, or Center say that all towns of the size of his have been provided for. I have just named many scores of such towns, each larger than any of these, which have not been provided for. Several of them are in the State of Texas.

There were 425 American towns in the same class with Jacksonville—that is, having receipts during 1925 of more than \$20,000 and less than \$30,000—which have no public buildings and are not listed in this report for present relief.

There are above 1,000 towns in the same class with Center; that is, they have postal receipts of more than \$10,000 and less than \$20,000 and have no public buildings, and are not listed for one in this report.

In view of these facts, every one of which is supported by the official record, I hope no citizen will hereafter think or say that his town is the only one, or the largest one of its class, which has no public building and no immediate prospect of any.

Crockett, a neighboring, friendly city in an adjoining district, has no Federal building and is not yet listed to receive one under the present plan.

In the new Federal six-year buildings law mentioned above, under which the Government is now operating, it is provided that at least two new buildings for points having none shall be provided for each State. The two Texas towns which are in line to obtain these two buildings under the present program are Lubbock and Huntsville. I quote from the report of Secretary Mellon and Postmaster General New as to why these two points were recommended by them:

Lubbock: The population in 1920, according to the last census, was 9,687. The population is estimated at the present time to be 15,000, and the population served 22,000. Postal receipts for the fiscal year 1922 were \$30,051.54, and for 1926, \$81,574.63.

The principal industries, in the order of their importance, are stock farming, wholesale groceries, and retailing. The post office pays \$2,100 for its rented quarters. The building is a one-story brick structure, heated by coal stoves, with a roof that leaks and was broken down twice. The rapid growth of this city is due to farming replacing the cattle-raising business. All large stock ranches have been cut into farms. The land is productive and the prospects are that the city will continue to have a substantial growth.

It is recommended that Lubbock be considered as a site for a new Federal building. The Government does not own a site at this place, but the town exceeds all others in population, population served, and postal receipts.

Huntsville: * * * There is a State penitentiary located here, two banks, one college, with attendance from 2,200 to 2,500, and one negro preparatory school. * * *

We recommend that Huntsville be given consideration as the second city in the State entitled to a new Federal building, owing to its being an educational center and having a Government-owned site.

Immediately after the final passage of this law in 1926, hoping to get Lufkin in this part of the first year's plan, I again took up the matter with the offices of the Secretaries who were to make the survey, select the towns to receive public buildings, and make this report. Mr. Hall, the secretary of the Chamber of Commerce of Lufkin, will recall my request made of him in June of 1926 for further data to support my effort. Mr. Hall's office should show a considerable correspondence between me and him about it at that time. Postmaster Evans's files should show that in cooperating with Mr. Hall he prepared a statement of the post-office situation at Lufkin showing the facts creating the necessity for a building, which either Mr. Evans or Mr. Hall forwarded to me and which, with other data, I presented to the departments, urging that provision be made for Lufkin in this connection. My presentations in behalf of needy points within our district were by personal appearance and by written statements. In response to one of these appeals First Assistant Postmaster General John H. Bartlett wrote me as follows:

JULY 9, 1926.

Hon. JOHN C. BOX,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. BOX: I have yours of the 7th instant, forwarding a copy of a report in regard to the postal situation at Lufkin, Tex.

The requirements of the service at Lufkin will receive our careful consideration in connection with other similar projects under the recently enacted public buildings act.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN H. BARTLETT,
First Assistant Postmaster General.

The Supervising Architect in the Treasury Department, whose office handles this business for the Secretary of the Treasury, answering a communication similar to the one addressed to the Post Office Department mentioned above, wrote me a letter, which I quote:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF SUPERVISING ARCHITECT,
Washington, D. C., July 16, 1926.

Hon. JOHN C. BOX,
House of Representatives, United States.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Referring to your letter of July 7 in the interest of the citizens of Lufkin, Tex., and the need of that town for a Federal building under the recent legislation, permit me to advise you that the department will give full consideration to the facts set forth by you in this connection.

The interest you take in the matter is appreciated, and the department realizes the anxiety of the various communities throughout the country to have their claims given early consideration. * * *

By direction of the Secretary.

Very truly yours,

JAMES A. WETMORE,
Acting Supervising Architect.

Continuing these efforts in behalf of Lufkin and other points from the date I came here until the present, I recently made urgent representations to the departments interested. In response to one of these, under date of February 17, 1927, Hon. John H. Bartlett, First Assistant Postmaster General, wrote me as follows:

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
FIRST ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL,
Washington, February 17, 1927.

Hon. JOHN C. BOX,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. BOX: I have yours of the 15th instant, concerning the erection of a Government-owned building at Lufkin, Tex.

Should Congress appropriate sufficient additional money to permit us to take up places where conditions are similar to those at Lufkin, the claims of that city will have every possible consideration.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN H. BARTLETT,
First Assistant Postmaster General.

And the Treasury Department advised as follows:

CONTEMPLATED BUILDINGS, LUFKIN, TEX.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, February 19, 1927.

Hon. JOHN C. BOX,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The Treasury has your joint letter of February 15 with respect to the matter of constructing a post-office building at Lufkin, Tex., and setting forth needs of Lufkin for a Government-owned building.

Your interest in this matter is greatly appreciated, and in ascertaining the extent to which the Treasury will be able to undertake con-

struction in case Congress establishes an additional authorization of \$100,000,000 further consideration will be given to the needs of Lufkin for a building.

Very truly yours,

CARL T. SCHUNEMAN,
Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

I give these facts pertaining to Lufkin because they are pertinent to Lufkin's situation and my efforts in that behalf.

These efforts, which have been continued steadily since my first service here nearly eight years ago, will be continued. I have continued to urge upon the departments handling this business the needy situation at Beaumont, Lufkin, and other points. Sooner or later I expect to succeed in my efforts to meet the necessities of these towns. I have never made any extravagant promises, because I have known this situation and had no inclination to deceive the people. When the Government gets down to cities having no sites and substantially the same postal receipts as those having the largest receipts within our district I expect to get further favorable action. If some one else succeeds me before that is accomplished he will find facts and urgings in behalf of the needs of our district in the minds of officials and in the files of the departments dealing with the subject. The anxiety of the good people of these cities who are interested in this needed development is felt and appreciated by me. The situation of our people is the result of and a part of the nation-wide situation which I have pointed out above, and resulting from no lack of service on my part. No criticism of me based on lack of information will in any manner lessen my efforts. Such criticism could not increase my efforts, because I have been diligent to the utmost. I know that the overwhelming majority of the people of these communities are intelligent and fair. Even if they were not, my recognition of my duty to serve them faithfully and impartially would continue.

It is highly probable that the towns having the largest postal receipts and being without public buildings will be reached first, not because of any favoritism of mine, but because that will probably be the policy of the Government, which I can not attack or change. To help the most needy points first seems to be my duty. At the same time it helps to open the way for relief for less urgent situations.

Supplementing and evidencing my many personal visits, presentations, and appeals, my files are bulging with records of my efforts in behalf of all of the four points for whose relief I have introduced bills and otherwise interested myself.

The proposed authorization, which is by no means an appropriation, for the expenditure of an additional \$100,000,000 for buildings outside the District of Columbia during the next six years had my active support and was passed by the House during the session just closed. It failed to pass the Senate because of the efforts of certain Senators—usually called a filibuster—to prevent a further investigation of election corruption in certain States.

Under the present law \$25,000,000 per year is all that can be expended on this building program. If the act which failed in the Senate had passed, that sum would have been increased to \$35,000,000 per year.

The House passed an appropriation of \$19,879,700 for use during the approaching year in starting this program. That amount was insufficient and did not reach the \$25,000,000 authorized under present law, much less the \$35,000,000 limit which we tried to write into the law. But even that meager appropriation for buildings during the approaching fiscal year failed because of the legislative situation in the Senate already referred to.

In passing on the work of his public servant the citizen has a right to know the facts. To talk without knowing is foolish. Intelligent citizens want to know the facts in order to be fair. The people of the second congressional district and the people of the four cities mentioned have been generous with me and I have been faithful to them. With this statement, to which I could add much, I leave the facts with them.

ADDENDA

The following are some of the Texas cities having no Federal buildings and having no provision yet made for them, with their postal receipts for 1925 and 1926:

City	Receipts 1925	Receipts 1926
Mexia.....	\$46,610	\$47,812
Plainview.....	45,281	51,539
Sweetwater.....	45,098	59,414
Breckenridge.....	42,557	50,165
Taylor.....	34,173	34,881
Lubbock.....	76,128	81,122
Cisco.....	29,183	40,184
Lufkin.....	30,926	34,529
Jacksonville.....	29,503	33,073
Center.....	12,086	13,337

There are throughout the Nation many hundreds of cities larger than the largest of ours having no public buildings and great numbers of others having wholly inadequate facilities which have business and receipts many times as great as the greatest of ours having no buildings; all of which is pointed out in the main body of these remarks.

As stated, the appropriation bill carrying an utterly inadequate amount but intended to start relief measures at many places, including four in Texas, during the approaching fiscal year, failed of passage in the Senate, so that the building program stands still for another year, unless the departments can adopt some expedient to avoid the failure of the Senate to pass that appropriation.

SPECIAL ASSISTANTS, BOARD OF TAX APPEALS

Mr. GREEN of Iowa, from the Committee on Ways and Means, reported the bill (H. R. 16910) to provide for the employment of special assistants by the Board of Tax Appeals, which was referred to the Union Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered printed.

CONFERENCE REPORT—URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, I present a conference report on the bill (H. R. 16462) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1927, and prior fiscal years, and to provide urgent supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1927, and for other purposes, for printing under the rule.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Craven, its principal clerk, announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 16249) entitled "An act making appropriations for the military and nonmilitary activities of the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House of Representatives, and agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed as conferees on the part of the Senate Mr. WADSWORTH, Mr. JONES of Washington, Mr. REED of Pennsylvania, Mr. FLETCHER, and Mr. HARRIS.

HOUSE BILLS AND HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. CAMPBELL, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that this day they presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills:

- H. R. 585. An act for the relief of Frederick Marshall;
- H. R. 1105. An act for the relief of the Kelly Springfield Motor Truck Co. of California;
- H. R. 1330. An act for the relief of Helene M. Hnbrich;
- H. R. 1464. An act for the relief of Charles C. Hughes;
- H. R. 2184. An act for the relief of James Gaynor;
- H. R. 2491. An act for the relief of Gordan A. Dennis;
- H. R. 4376. An act to allow and credit the accounts of Joseph R. Hebblethwaite, formerly captain, Quartermaster Corps, United States Army, the sum of \$237.90 disallowed by the Comptroller General of the United States;
- H. R. 4719. An act for the relief of the New Braunfels Brewing Co.;
- H. R. 5866. An act for the relief of the Lehigh Coal & Navigation Co.;
- H. R. 5991. An act authorizing the adjustment of the boundaries of the Black Hills and Harney Forests, and for other purposes;
- H. R. 6586. An act for the relief of Russell W. Simpson;
- H. R. 6806. An act authorizing the payment of a claim to Alexander J. Thompson;
- H. R. 7156. An act for the relief of Maurice E. Kinsey;
- H. R. 7617. An act to authorize payment to the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., a corporation, for damage to its rolling stock at Raritan Arsenal, Metuchen, N. J., on August 16, 1922;
- H. R. 7921. An act to authorize the Commissioner of the General Land Office to dispose by sale of certain public land in the State of Arkansas;
- H. R. 8345. An act for the relief of Crane Co.;
- H. R. 8685. An act for the relief of Henry S. Royce;
- H. R. 9045. An act to establish a national military park at and near Fredericksburg, Va., and to mark and preserve historical points connected with the battles of Fredericksburg, Spotsylvania Court House, Wilderness, and Chancellorsville, including Salem Church, Va.;
- H. R. 9287. An act for the relief of Albert G. Tuxhorn;
- H. R. 9667. An act for the relief of Columbus P. Pierce;
- H. R. 9912. An act approving the transaction of the adjutant general of the State of Oregon in issuing property to sufferers

from a fire in Astoria, Oreg., and relieving the United States property and disbursing officer of the State of Oregon and the State of Oregon from accountability therefor;

H. R. 10076. An act for the relief of the estate of William C. Perry, late of Cross Creek Township, Washington County, Pa.;

H. R. 10130. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Navy, in his discretion, to deliver to the president of the Rotary Club, of Crawfordsville, Montgomery County, Ind., a bell of a battleship that is now, or may be, in his custody;

H. R. 10725. An act for the relief of Capt. C. R. Insley;

H. R. 11325. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, and acts in amendment thereof;

H. R. 11762. An act to provide for the sale of uniforms to individuals separated from the military or naval forces of the United States;

H. R. 12064. An act providing for a grant of land to the county of San Juan, in the State of Washington, for recreational and public-park purposes;

H. R. 12212. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to dispose of obsolete aeronautical equipment to accredited schools, colleges, and universities;

H. R. 12309. An act for the relief of the Bell Telephone Co., of Philadelphia, Pa., and the Illinois Bell Telephone Co.;

H. R. 12852. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to accept on behalf of the United States title in fee simple to a certain strip of land and the construction of a bridge across Archers Creek in South Carolina;

H. R. 12889. An act to relinquish the title of the United States to the land in the claim of Moses Steadham, situate in the county of Baldwin, State of Alabama;

H. R. 12931. An act to provide for maintaining, promoting, and advertising the International Trade Exhibition;

H. R. 13481. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to accept title for post-office site at Olyphant, Pa., with mineral reservations;

H. R. 14248. An act to amend the provision contained in the act approved March 3, 1915, providing that the Chief of Naval Operations, during the temporary absence of the Secretary and Assistant Secretary of the Navy, shall be next in succession to act as Secretary of the Navy;

H. R. 15337. An act to amend section 476 and section 4934 of the Revised Statutes;

H. R. 15604. An act for the promotion of rifle practice throughout the United States;

H. R. 15651. An act to encourage breeding of riding horses for Army purposes;

H. R. 15653. An act to furnish public quarters, fuel, and light to certain civilian instructors in the United States Military Academy;

H. R. 15821. An act to revise the boundary of the Hawaii National Park on the island of Maui in the Territory of Hawaii;

H. R. 15959. An act making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 233. House joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of War to loan certain French guns which belong to the United States and are now in the city park at Walla Walla, Wash., to the city of Walla Walla, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 34 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, February 10, 1927, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Mr. TILSON submitted the following tentative list of committee hearings scheduled for Thursday, February 10, 1927, as reported to the floor leader by clerks of the several committees:

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

(10.30 a. m.)

Second deficiency bill.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

(10.30 a. m.)

To amend the Federal farm loan act (H. R. 15540).

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS
(10.30 a. m.)

To adjust the payment of the balances due by purchases of coal and asphalt deposits in the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations in Oklahoma (H. R. 16689).

COMMITTEE ON PATENTS
(10 a. m.)

To amend sections 27, 42, and 44 of the act entitled "An act to amend and consolidate the acts respecting copyright," approved March 4, 1909 (H. R. 16808).

COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS
(10.30 a. m.)

Authorizing the acceptance by the Navy Department of a site for an aviation training field in the vicinity of Pensacola, Fla., and for other purposes (H. R. 16994).

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

953. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1926, and supplemental estimates of appropriations for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1927, and June 30, 1928, together with certain audited claims and final judgments against the District of Columbia, amounting in all to \$1,205,863.01; also six items of proposed legislation affecting existing legislation (H. Doc. No. 697); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

954. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the legislative establishment under the Architect of the Capitol, for the fiscal years 1920 and 1921, in the sum of \$1,067.80 (H. Doc. No. 698); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

955. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a list of leases granted by the Secretary of War under authority of said act during the calendar year 1926; to the Committee on Expenditures in the War Department.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. BARKLEY: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 16888. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the Paducah Board of Trade (Inc.), of Paducah, Ky., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Ohio River; with amendment (Rept. No. 2018). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SWING: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 16555. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue patent to the county of Del Norte, State of California, to Whaler Island, in Crescent City Bay, Del Norte County, Calif., for purposes of a public wharf; without amendment (Rept. No. 2019). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SINNOTT: Committee on the Public Lands. S. 3963. An act to provide for the protection, development, and utilization of the public lands in Alaska by establishing an adequate system for grazing livestock thereon; with amendment (Rept. No. 2020). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. PORTER: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. J. Res. 350. A joint resolution to provide for the payment of claims of certain German nationals against the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 2024). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ABERNETHY: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 14881. A bill to relinquish to its equitable owners the title of the United States to the land in the claims of A. Moro and of Anthony Campbell in Jackson County, Miss.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2025). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. COLE: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. J. Res. 351. A joint resolution to provide for the expenses of the participation of the United States in the work of the economic conference to be held at Geneva, Switzerland; without amendment (Rept. No. 2026). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. VESTAL: Committee on Patents. H. R. 16548. A bill to amend sections 57 and 61 of the act entitled "An act to amend and consolidate the acts respecting copyright," approved March 4, 1909; with amendment (Rept. No. 2027). Referred

to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SPROUL of Illinois: Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. H. R. 3840. A bill to amend the act of February 28, 1925, fixing the compensation of employees in post offices; with amendment (Rept. No. 2028). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. S. J. Res. 152. A joint resolution to amend subdivisions (b) and (c) of section 11 of the immigration act of 1924, as amended; with amendment (Rept. No. 2029). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 16910. A bill to provide for the employment of special assistants by the Board of Tax Appeals; without amendment (Rept. No. 2030). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. UNDERHILL: Committee on Claims. S. 2348. An act for the relief of Nick Masonich; with amendment (Rept. No. 2021). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SPEAKS: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 8443. A bill for the relief of James E. Moyer; without amendment (Rept. No. 2022). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. REECE: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 14708. A bill authorizing the Secretary of War to place the name of Joseph F. Ritchardson on the rolls of Company C, One hundred and twenty-second Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and issue him an honorable discharge; with amendment (Rept. No. 2023). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DICKSTEIN: A bill (H. R. 17035) to provide for the deportation of any alien who fails to maintain his wife or minor child living abroad; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HARRISON: A bill (H. R. 17036) to amend the immigration law so as to permit persons engaged in agriculture to enter the United States in excess of the quota fixed by the statute; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HAYDEN: A bill (H. R. 17037) granting certain public lands to the town of Florence, Ariz., for municipal, park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. PARKS: A bill (H. R. 17038) to amend section 71 of the Judicial Code, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ROGERS: A bill (H. R. 17039) to amend the World War veterans' act, 1924, as amended; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 17040) to conserve the revenues from medicinal spirits and provide for the effective Government control of such spirits, to prevent the evasion of taxes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GARBER: A bill (H. R. 17041) to repeal section 9 of the act entitled "An act to provide for stock-raising homesteads, and for other purposes," approved December 29, 1916; to the Committee on Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17042) providing for reimbursement of the Ponca Indian tribal fund for sums expended by the Ponca Indian Agency at Ponca City, Okla., and prohibiting further expenditures without the consent of the tribe; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND: A bill (H. R. 17043) classifying and fixing salaries of United States commissioners in Alaska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: A bill (H. R. 17044) to provide funds for the upkeep of the Puyallup Indian cemetery at Tacoma, Wash.; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. ZIHLMAN: A bill (H. R. 17045) to amend section 115a of an act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FISH: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 352) to provide for the expenses of the participation of the United States in the work of a preparatory commission to consider questions of reduction and limitation of armaments; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PORTER: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 353) for the relief of the consulate general at Yokohama, Japan; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, urging favorable action upon Senate bill 4627, providing for the development of the Umatilla Rapids power and irrigation project on the Columbia River; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. ROWBOTTOM: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Indiana, to abolish Federal estate tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Iowa: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Iowa, favoring the improvement of the Mississippi River and the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. WILLIAMSON: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, regarding a treaty between the United States and the Dominion of Canada for the development of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence ship canal; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. GARBER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, requesting an investigation of the reports and facts of the contracts entered into between the United States and Fred Herrick for the sale of lumber in Malheur National Forest; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Indiana, urging the enactment of sound agricultural legislation; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Indiana, urging the appropriating of funds for a United States Veterans' Bureau general hospital; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. THURSTON: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Iowa, urging the necessary appropriation for the construction of the St. Lawrence waterway and for the improvement of the Mississippi waterway; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ABERNETHY: A bill (H. R. 17046) for the relief of Will J. Allen; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ANDRESEN: A bill (H. R. 17047) granting a pension to Agnes Hughes Carnes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17048) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Johnson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17049) granting an increase of pension to Maria Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BACHMANN: A bill (H. R. 17050) granting an increase of pension to George Williams; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BROWNING: A bill (H. R. 17051) granting an increase of pension to Lucinda M. Melson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CANNON: A bill (H. R. 17052) granting a pension to Martha M. Luttrell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CONNERY: A bill (H. R. 17053) granting a pension to Annie McCarthy; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17054) granting a pension to Jennie B. Southwick; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17055) granting a pension to Mary Gertrude Hickey; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DAVENPORT: A bill (H. R. 17056) granting an increase of pension to Rosetta Cleveland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HARRISON: A bill (H. R. 17057) granting an annuity to Dr. Robert P. Cooke; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KIESS: A bill (H. R. 17058) for the relief of Walter E. Switzer; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KINDRED: A bill (H. R. 17059) for the relief of Harikleia Coundourianes for the payment of claims for pay, personal injuries, loss of property, and other purposes incident to the blasting of Hell Gate Channel; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17060) for the relief of Vasilios M. Coundourianes for the payment of claims for pay, personal injuries, loss of property, and other purposes incident to the blasting of Hell Gate Channel; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MORGAN: A bill (H. R. 17061) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SCHAFER: A bill (H. R. 17062) granting an increase of pension to Flora Kaufer; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. UNDERHILL: A bill (H. R. 17063) for the relief of C. G. Duganne and A. N. Ross; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

6326. Petition of city council of the city of Chicago, indorsing legislation to authorize loans by the United States Veterans' Bureau on adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6327. By Mr. ANTHONY: Petition of citizens of Topeka, Kans., in favor of House bill 10311 for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

6328. Also, petition of citizens of Shawnee County, State of Kansas, for acknowledgment of the authority of Christ and the law of God in the United States Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6329. By Mr. ARNOLD: Petition of Mrs. Rose E. Biggs, Robinson, Ill., favoring the enactment of the Civil War pension bill into law; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6330. Also, petition from citizens of Sumner, Ill., urging the passage of the Civil War pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6331. By Mr. ARENTZ: Petition of citizens of Battle Mountain, Nev., urging that the Congress take immediate steps to bring about a vote on a Civil War pension bill affording relief to needy and suffering veterans and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6332. By Mr. BARKLEY: Petition of numerous voters of Graves County, Ky., favoring an increase in Civil War pensions; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6333. Also, petition of numerous voters of Graves County, Ky., in favor of an increase in Civil War pensions; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6334. By Mr. BLOOM: Petition of New York City Federation of Women's Clubs, protesting against the failure of Congress to provide the funds to maintain the Navy in accord with the 5-5-3 ratio and the refusal of the House of Representatives to provide funds to lay down at least the three cruisers authorized, and urging the maintenance of the Army of the United States in accord with the provisions of the national defense act of 1920; to the Committee on Appropriations.

6335. Also, petition of Government Club (Inc.), protesting against the failure of Congress to provide the funds to maintain the Navy in accord with the 5-5-3 ratio and the refusal of the House of Representatives to provide funds to lay down at least the three cruisers authorized, and urging the maintenance of the Army of the United States in accord with the provisions of the national defense act of 1920, and further urging upon Congress that it appraise the opposition of defeatist organizations and their irresponsibility in the premises; to the Committee on Appropriations.

6336. By Mr. BOWMAN: Petition from 224 voters of Mineral, Tucker, Monongalia, and other counties in the second district of West Virginia, urging action by Congress in providing further relief for Civil War veterans and their dependents; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6337. Also, petition of 355 voters of the second congressional district of West Virginia, urging immediate action by the House on legislation providing for higher pension rates to Civil War widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6338. By Mr. BRIGGS: Petition of number of citizens of Liberty County, Tex., with regard to Civil War pensions; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6339. By Mr. BROWNE: Petition of citizens of Amherst, Wood County, Wis., urging that immediate steps be taken to bring to a vote the Civil War pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6340. By Mr. BURTNESS: Petition of 37 residents of Cayuga, N. Dak., urging the passage by Congress of a bill granting an increased pension to Civil War veterans and the widows of Civil War veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6341. By Mr. CAMPBELL: Petition of citizens of Mifflin Township, Allegheny County, Pa., urging the passage of a bill increasing the pensions of Civil War veterans and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6342. By Mr. CANFIELD: Petition of Isophine Ward and 63 other residents of Dearborn County, Ind., urging the passage of legislation for increasing the pensions of Civil War soldiers

and widows of Civil War veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6343. By Mr. CANNON: Petition of J. S. Park and 61 other citizens of Foley, Mo., indorsing enactment of pension-increase legislation; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6344. Also, petition of Mrs. Josephine Ellison and 116 other citizens of Sullivan, Mo., indorsing enactment of pension-increase legislation; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6345. By Mr. CARSS: Petition of auxiliary of the Howard Bennett Post, No. 246, American Legion, in opposition to Welsh bill, to abolish military training in certain of our land-grant colleges; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

6346. By Mr. CHALMERS: Petition signed by 27 residents of Lucas County, Ohio, urging that immediate action be taken to increase the pensions of all Civil War veterans and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6347. By Mr. CONNERY: Resolution of the citizens of Lynn, requesting action on the Civil War pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6348. By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: Petition of certain residents of Lake Geneva, Wis., urging passage of bill to increase pensions of Civil War veterans and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6349. Also, petition of certain residents of Racine, Wis., urging passage of House bill 10311, Sunday rest bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

6350. Also, petition of certain residents of Darien, Walworth County, Wis., urging passage of bill to increase pensions of Civil War veterans and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6351. Also, petition of certain residents of Racine County, Wis., protesting against passage of House bill 10311, Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

6352. By Mr. CULLEN: Resolution passed by the Board of Aldermen of the City of New York on January 25, 1927, memorializing Congress to pass bill helping veterans to get loans on soldiers' bonus certificates; to the Committee on World War Legislation.

6353. By Mr. DAVENPORT: Petition of residents of Rome, N. Y., favoring the enactment of pending legislation to increase the pensions of Civil War veterans and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6354. By Mr. DAVIS: Petition of citizens of Coffee County, Tenn., urging passage of Civil War pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6355. Also, petition of citizens of Bedford County, Tenn., urging passage of civil War pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6356. By Mr. DENISON: Petition of certain citizens of Thebes, Ill., urging that immediate steps be taken to bring to a vote a Civil War pension bill carrying the rates proposed by the National Tribune in order that relief may be accorded to needy and suffering veterans and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6357. By Mr. DOUGLASS: Petition of Frank R. Shepard, vice president of the General Baking Co., 62 Bunker Hill Street, Charlestown, Boston, Mass., urging defeat of the so-called McNary-Haugen farm relief bill, now pending in the Congress, stating that the passage of this measure would increase the price of flour about \$2 per barrel, and would result in the price of bread and other products all over the country to increase, and at the same time cause consumption to fall off; to the Committee on Agriculture.

6358. By Mr. EATON: Petition of Mrs. M. E. Fletcher, 221 Church Street, Bound Brook, N. J., and 90 other residents of Bound Brook, urging that immediate steps be taken to bring Civil War pension bill to vote, and asking support by Members of Congress; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6359. By Mr. ROY G. FITZGERALD: Petition of Wayne County Council of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, of Detroit, Mich., praying for a special rule for immediate consideration of House bill 4548 for retirement of disabled emergency Army officers of the World War; to the Committee on Rules.

6360. Also, petition of the City Interpost Council of the American Legion of Los Angeles, asking Congress to pass House bill 4548, for retirement of disabled emergency officers of the World War; to the Committee on Rules.

6361. Also, petition of Post No. 1, Disabled American Veterans of the World War, per John R. Quinn, president, for Congress to pass Fitzgerald bill (H. R. 4548) for retirement of disabled emergency Army officers of the World War; to the Committee on Rules.

6362. Also, petition of Post No. 177, American Legion, Ocean Park, Calif., unanimously indorsing House bill 4548, for the retirement of disabled emergency officers of the World War,

and urging that a vote by House be had upon the bill; to the Committee on Rules.

6363. By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petition of James R. Gormley, post-office box 158, Ormond Beach, Fla., urging early and favorable consideration of Resolution 315, which would make the columbine the national flower of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Library.

6364. By Mr. GARDNER of Indiana: Petition of Mary E. Dean and Joseph M. Dean, of Pekin, Ind., urging that immediate steps be taken to bring to a vote a Civil War pension bill in order that relief may be accorded to needy and suffering veterans and widows of veterans, and further urging that the most hearty support on the part of our Senators and Representatives in Congress be accorded this legislation; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6365. By Mr. HOOPER: Petition of Mrs. Ida Guntin and 78 other residents of Battle Creek, Mich., in favor of pending legislation to increase the present rates of pensions of Civil War veterans, their widows, and dependents; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6366. By Mr. JACOBSTEIN: Petition signed by citizens of Rochester, N. Y., urging passage of the Civil War pension bill for the relief of needy veterans and widows of that war; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6367. Also, petition signed by citizens of Rochester, N. Y., urging passage of the Civil War pension bill for the relief of needy veterans and widows of that war; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6368. By Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana: Petition of six citizens of Vigo County, Ind., urging the passage of legislation for the relief of Civil War veterans and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6369. By Mr. KEARNS: Petition of citizens of Portsmouth, Ohio, urging passage of Civil War pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6370. By Mr. KIEFNER: Petition from patrons of St. Francois County, Mo., urging Congress to pass legislation for the relief of needy and suffering Civil War veterans and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6371. Also, petition from the citizens of St. Francois County, Mo., urging the passage of legislation for the relief of needy and suffering Civil War veterans and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6372. Also, petition of citizens of Springdale, Pa., favoring increased pensions for Civil War veterans and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6373. By Mr. KIESS: Petition from citizens of Tioga County, Pa., favoring the passage of the Elliott pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6374. By Mr. KIRK: Petition of citizens of Sturgeon, Owsley County, Ky., in support of Civil War pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6375. By Mr. LEA of California: Petition of 82 residents of Sonoma County, Calif., urging passage of Civil War pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6376. Also, petition of 115 residents of Rohnerville, Calif., favoring passage of Civil War pension legislation; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6377. By Mr. LETTS: Petition of Mrs. Catherine E. Bane and Mrs. Mary M. Green, of North Liberty, Iowa, urging the passage of the Civil War pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6378. By Mr. LITTLE: Petition signed by 71 residents of Ottawa, Kans., urging that immediate steps be taken to bring to a vote a Civil War pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6379. Also, petitions signed by 20 voters of Kansas City, Kans., and 64 voters of Humboldt, Kans., urging that immediate steps be taken to bring to a vote a Civil War pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6380. By Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan: Petition of 46 citizens of Muskegon, Muskegon County, Mich., for a liberalization of the Civil War pension laws; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6381. By Mr. McREYNOLDS: Petition from the voters of Tellico Plains, Monroe County, Tenn., urging that immediate steps be taken to bring to a vote the bill for the relief of needy and suffering veterans and widows of the Civil War; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6382. Also, petition from the voters of Cleveland, Bradley County, Tenn., urging that immediate steps be taken to bring to a vote the bill for the relief of needy and suffering veterans and widows of the Civil War; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6383. By Mr. McSWEENEY: Petition of citizens of Alliance, Ohio, asking further relief for veterans of the Civil War and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6384. By Mr. MANLOVE: Petition of G. W. Dogle, W. G. Faigan, and 50 others, of Jasper County, Mo., against Sunday legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

6385. By Mr. MORROW: Petition of citizens of Albuquerque, N. Mex., indorsing legislation for Civil War veterans and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6386. By Mr. O'CONNELL of New York: Petition of the New York Institute for the Education of the Blind urging legislation to regulate the importation of woven goods so that blind weavers may not be put out of business; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

6387. Also, petition of F. Jarka Co. (Inc.), of New York City, favoring the passage of Senate bill 3170, known as the Cummins Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

6388. By Mr. RAMSEYER: Petition of residents of Grinnell, Iowa, urging that immediate steps be taken to bring to a vote a Civil War pension bill in order that relief may be accorded to needy and suffering veterans and widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6389. By Mr. ROWBOTTOM: Petition of H. R. Nevins and others that the McNary-Haugen bill be enacted into law at this session of Congress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

6390. By Mr. SINNOTT: Petition of certain citizens of Long Creek and Ritter, Oreg., with reference to further increase in pensions for veterans of the Civil War and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6391. By Mr. SOMERS of New York: Petition of citizens of the sixth congressional district, New York, in favor of Civil War pension legislation; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6392. By Mr. SUMMERS of Washington: Petition signed by John A. Wyers and others, of White Salmon, Wash., protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

6393. Also, petition signed by Mark Overbaugh and others, of Portland, Oreg., protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

6394. Also, petition signed by Mrs. J. R. Hunt and others, of Bingen, Wash., protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

6395. Also, petition signed by R. A. Randall and others, of Husum, Wash., protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

6396. Also, petition signed by J. M. Buce and others, of Trout Lake, Wash., protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

6397. By Mr. SWARTZ: Petition of Abraham Lincoln Post, No. 4, Grand Army of the Republic of Colorado and Wyoming, favoring new legislation for increased pensions for veterans of the Civil War and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6398. Also, petition of Affiliated Orders of the Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Colorado and Wyoming, favoring new pension legislation providing for increases for Civil War veterans and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6399. Also, petition of W. A. Pope and others, of Harrisburg, Pa., favoring new pension legislation for Civil War veterans and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6400. By Mr. SWING: Petition of certain residents of Fullerton, Calif., urging the passage by Congress of a bill granting increased pensions to Civil War veterans and the widows of Civil War veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6401. Also, petition of certain residents of Orange, Calif., urging the passage by Congress of a bill providing for increased pensions to Civil War veterans and the widows of Civil War veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6402. Also, petition of certain residents of Santa Ana, Calif., urging the passage by Congress of a bill granting increased pensions to Civil War veterans and the widows of Civil War veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6403. Also, petition of certain residents of San Diego, Calif., protesting against the passage by Congress of House bills 7179, 7822, 10123, and 10311, or any other "religious" measure; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

6404. Also, petition of certain residents of Arlington, Calif., protesting against the passage by Congress of House bill 10311 or any other bill for the compulsory observance of Sunday; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

6405. Also, petition of certain residents of National City, Calif., protesting against the passage by Congress of House bills

7179, 7822, 10123, and 10311, or any other "religious" measure; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

6406. Also, petition of certain residents of California, protesting against the passage by Congress of House bill 10311 or any other bill for the compulsory observance of Sunday; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

6407. Also, petition of certain residents of California, protesting against the passage by Congress of House bill 10311 or any other bill for the compulsory observance of Sunday; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

6408. By Mr. THOMPSON: Petition of divers citizens of Putnam County, Ohio, urging passage of more liberal pension legislation for veterans of the Civil War and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6409. By Mr. THURSTON: Petition of citizens of Chariton, Iowa, and vicinity, urging an increased compensation for Civil War veterans and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6410. Also, petition of citizens of Shambaugh, Iowa, and vicinity, urging an increased compensation for Civil War veterans and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6411. Also, petition of citizens of Shambaugh, Iowa, and vicinity, urging an increased compensation for Civil War veterans and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6412. By Mr. WASON: Petition of Margaret A. Day, Bertwell E. Root, and Carl Day, three citizens of Berlin, N. H., urging that immediate action be taken to bring to a vote a Civil War pension bill in order that relief may be accorded to needy and suffering veterans and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6413. Also, petition of Stephen M. Thornton and 43 other citizens of Cornish Flat, N. H., urging that immediate steps be taken to bring to a vote a Civil War pension bill in order that relief may be accorded to needy and suffering veterans and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6414. Also, petition of Oliver P. Murdick and 13 other residents of Keene, N. H., urging that immediate action be taken to bring to a vote a Civil War pension bill in order that relief may be accorded to needy and suffering veterans and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6415. Also, petition of William B. Graham and eight other residents of Greenville, N. H., urging that immediate action be taken to bring to a vote a Civil War pension bill in order that relief may be accorded to needy and suffering veterans and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6416. Also, petition of Mary A. Traxler and 63 other residents of Bennington, N. H., urging that immediate action be taken to bring to a vote a Civil War pension bill in order that relief may be accorded to needy and suffering veterans and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6417. By Mr. WOLVERTON: Petition of Mrs. O. M. Ward and other residents of Upshur County, W. Va., urging the passage of the bill now pending in Congress for the relief of Civil War widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6418. Also, petition of Lucretia Gum and other residents of Harrison County, W. Va., asking that the bill now pending in Congress for the relief of Civil War widows be passed; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

SENATE

THURSDAY, February 10, 1927

(Legislative day of Wednesday, February 9, 1927)

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate will receive a message from the House of Representatives.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 16888) granting the consent of Congress to the Paducah Board of Trade (Inc.), of Paducah, Ky., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Ohio River, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were thereupon signed by the Vice President:

S. 5197. An act to authorize an appropriation for reconnaissance work in conjunction with the middle Rio Grande con-