

ACTION TO INSURE ADEQUACY OF APPEAL PRIOR TO SUBMISSION FOR REVIEW AND DETERMINATION BY BOARD OF VETERANS' APPEALS

For the purposes of Veterans' Regulation No. 2 (a), the following instructions on the above subject are hereby issued:

1. It will be realized that action by or in behalf of a veteran to insure the adequacy of his appeal is important because of the finality with which the character of the decisions to be rendered by the Board of Veterans' Appeals is vested under Veterans' Regulation No. 2 (a), part II, paragraphs I and II.

2. The twofold duty of adjudicating agencies to the Government and to the claimant, under the policy of the Veterans' Administration, requires that all proper assistance be accorded to the claimant in the prosecution of his claim. It is deemed to be of especial interest that such assistance be given wholeheartedly and fully in the examination of a file on appeal in order that every pertinent evidence available may be secured and that the claimant may be thoroughly advised of the steps necessary to put his case in the best possible condition for appellate consideration.

3. The assistance will be extended in the preparation of appeals on all questions that may properly be referred to the board of veterans' appeals. The adequacy of an appeal in the individual case will depend on the facts of record, but all appeals are to be given equal attention and equal consideration in this connection.

4. Authorization officers in the regional office or facility or attorney reviewers in the claims division, central office, will execute a certificate of adequacy before transmittal of an appeal, after they are satisfied that all available evidence has been fully developed and that all proper assistance has been accorded to the claimant, to be countersigned by the adjudication officer or the chief, claims division. Such a certificate will be executed in accordance with the attached exhibit A in all cases.

5. There are suggested below some guiding principles as to the adequacy of an appeal for the consideration of the authorization officers or the attorney reviewers.

(a) Substantial compliance of the application for review with the requirements of Veterans' Regulation No. 2 (a), part II, paragraphs VII and VIII.

(b) The exhaustion of all reasonable efforts to secure affidavits or statements from the physicians named in the application for pension.

(c) The exhaustion of all reasonable efforts to secure affidavits from laymen whose testimony according to the record may be helpful in the determination of the issue on appeal.

(d) The presentation of all reasonable leads by the claimant to facilitate any further search in the service departments, believed necessary by reason of the facts existing in the individual case, for such additional information as may be of material consequence.

(e) The clearance of all questions affecting the correctness of the action appealed from through reference thereof, if necessary, to the Director of Compensation or the Director of Pensions for determination.

(f) The assurance that the claimant has been fully informed of the limitations and the effect attendant upon his appeal under Veterans' Regulation No. 2 (a), part II, and of the importance of exploiting the search for and the submission of all pertinent and material evidence in order that the final determination to be rendered may reflect the merits of his claim as accurately as possible.

6. The authorization officer or the attorney reviewer may utilize every facility at his disposal to secure through correspondence or other proper channels of contact such additional evidence as may be deemed necessary to insure a complete showing. Direct correspondence with physicians and laymen may first be instituted in lieu of personal contact. Care will be exercised at all times that correspondence in this connection is directed to the proper persons, with due regard to the capacity of the veteran or the circumstances surrounding the individual case. As herein indicated, a certificate will not be executed until all pertinent evidence available is secured, but if the claimant or his representative or attorney should insist on the determination of the appeal without the submission of any additional proofs suggested, a notation to that effect will be entered on the certificate. To obviate the overlapping of duties, contact representatives will continue to conduct such personal contact or interviews as may be necessary to furnish claimants or their representatives with nontechnical information or to assist these individuals in the execution of forms.

7. When it is found that the adequacy of an appeal has not been developed according to effective instructions, the Board of Veterans' Appeals will return the case concerned to the Director of Compensation or to the Director of Pensions for appropriate attention.

8. The certificate is to accompany the transmittal of every case forwarded to the central office for appellate consideration, according to the foregoing instructions, and a sufficient number of copies of exhibit A may be mimeographed at each field station to accommodate its needs.

(Instructions No. 3 of Aug. 21, 1933, to Veterans' Regulation No. 2 (a).)

The following is exhibit (A) referred to above:

EXHIBIT A

Veterans' Administration
Form P-8

CERTIFICATE OF ADEQUACY OF APPEAL UNDER VETERANS' REGULATION NO. 2 (A), INSTRUCTION NO. 3

Name -----

C No. -----

By -----

(Title: Guardian, attorney, etc.)

It is hereby certified that complete information has been given to the interested party on the rights and requirements of appeal, that all material facts have been fully developed, and that no error has been found in the current determination.

Date -----

(Authorization officer, attorney reviewer)

(Adjudication officer, chief, claims division)

RECESS

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Arkansas.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 22 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 27, 1934, at 12 o'clock meridian

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 26 (legislative day of Feb. 20), 1934

COMPTROLLER OF CUSTOMS

Thomas Temple Hoyne, of Chicago, Ill., to be comptroller of customs in customs collection district no. 39, with headquarters at Chicago, Ill., in place of Leslie L. Glenn.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

William J. O'Brien, of Buffalo, N.Y., to be collector of customs for customs collection district no. 9, with headquarters at Buffalo, N.Y., in place of Fred A. Bradley.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 26, 1934

The House met at 11 o'clock a.m.

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

As children of God and heirs of eternity, may Thy blessed spirit prevail among us—unite us, our Heavenly Father—and may our labors be established on a high plane. O reveal Thyself unto us as Thou didst to the prophets of old. Tell us Thy name and show us Thy glory. We would not resign ourselves to the eternal silence of the stars. Stimulate us to follow the code and the authority of the great Teacher of men, who took His own heartbeat, in the presence of human need, as the throb of eternal love. The Lord God endow with great wisdom and understanding all those who are clothed with authority; let all success include the poor and the unfortunate. Merciful Father, satisfy their necessities and their wholesome aspirations. Grant that the world above, the world around us, and the world within us may be so disclosed that we shall be very conscious of the renewal of strength and faith. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday last was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On February 24, 1934:

H.R. 6370. An act to extend the time for completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near South Omaha, Nebr.;

H.R. 6794. An act authorizing the State of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Delaware River at a point between Easton, Pa., and Phillipsburg, N.J.;

H.R. 6799. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Weldon Spring, Mo.;

H.R. 6909. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Des Moines River at or near St. Francisville, Mo.; and

H.R. 7291. An act authorizing the city of Hannibal, Mo., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near the city of Hannibal, Marion County, Mo.

On February 26, 1934:

H.R. 6492. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the St. Lawrence River at or near Alexandria Bay, N.Y.

THE PRIVATE CALENDAR

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order tomorrow to move that the House stand in recess until 7:30 p.m., at which time it shall be in order to call up bills on the Private Calendar unobjected to, beginning at Calendar No. 100.

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

Mr. BLANTON. Reserving the right to object, and, of course, I shall not object if the majority leader insists upon it, but I want to ask him a few questions. Why is it necessary to begin these night sessions now when the House has only four appropriation bills to pass to complete our work, and when soon we are going to be adjourning 3 days at a time for 2 months waiting for another body to pass bills? Why cannot we do this work in day sessions? Why should we have to hold night sessions in this blizzard weather? This is the worst spell of weather we have had in Washington for a long time, and Washington is almost snow-bound.

Mr. BYRNS. I will say that if the Members do not want the night sessions they can refuse unanimous consent. As the gentleman from Texas knows, we have tried for 2 days to dispose of some of the bills on the Private Calendar, and the gentleman is aware better than I am of the want of success.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Four days.

Mr. BYRNS. I stand corrected. The gentleman from Colorado is right, 4 days; and we have made no progress in calling the calendar, and I thought if we could have one or two night sessions we might be able to dispose of most of the bills on the calendar. I have no bills on the calendar myself.

Mr. BLANTON. I am aware of the many burdens that rest upon the shoulders of the majority leader. I am willing to work here every night if he wants it done. I work in my office every night anyway. If the majority leader believes that we can make better progress by holding night sessions, I am perfectly willing to back him on it. And I attend every night session that is held by this House.

Mr. BYRNS. These bills are private bills and, of course, of interest to Members. I was simply trying to accommodate the Membership of the House because many Members who have bills are becoming rather alarmed over the possibility that the bills may not pass in time to reach the Senate and be considered in that body.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman yield? I appreciate the fact that many Members are alarmed about their bills—I wanted mine, but could not get it. But I do not know why the gentleman should go back of the star. We always start at the star, and we ought to start at the star, and let every Member take his chance.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Speaker, my recollection is that a number of bills were called after we reached the number 100, which were objected to, on account of some misunderstanding. In other words, they were not objected to on their merit, and I thought it only fair to give those gentlemen who are interested in those bills an opportunity to have them considered on their merit. If the gentleman prefers to begin at the star, I have no objection.

Mr. SNELL. I think we should begin at the star.

Mr. BYRNS. Then, I shall modify my request.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, there is a great deal in what the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] says about the weather. If this snow continues, it is going to be almost impossible for a great many Members to come back at night. Since I have been here I have seen a 30-inch fall of snow, when Members could hardly get home and back in daytime. Would it not be well to wait for a day or so to see if the weather breaks, or, say, bring the House in at 10 o'clock in the morning, and devote the 2 hours between 10 and 12 to a call of the Private Calendar?

Mr. BYRNS. Oh, I think the House would object to that.

Mr. SNELL. There are too many committee meetings to permit of that.

Mr. BYRNS. On past experience we do not seem to get anywhere with day sessions devoted to the Private Calendar. If the gentleman objects to Tuesday night—

Mr. RANKIN. I am not going to object.

Mr. BLANTON. Why not make it Friday night.

Mr. RANKIN. I am not going to object, but I think under the circumstances it would be better to postpone the matter for a few days.

Mr. BYRNS. If I can satisfy my friend from Texas and my friend from Mississippi, I shall modify my request by making it Thursday night.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, I shall go along with the gentleman, no matter what night he fixes. But Thursday night would be preferable, as by that time we may get rid of some of the snow.

Mr. RANKIN. I am not going to object, but I think this night session ought to be postponed for a few days under the circumstances.

Mr. BYRNS. I so modify my request, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that on Thursday next it shall be in order to move to recess until 7:30 o'clock p.m., and that the evening session shall be devoted to the consideration of bills unobjected to on the Private Calendar, commencing with the star bill.

Is there objection?

There was no objection.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. SANDLIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8134) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and for the Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1935, and for other purposes. Pending that, I suggest to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. SINCLAIR] that we go along this afternoon without limiting the time for debate, the time to be equally divided between himself and myself.

Mr. SINCLAIR. That is satisfactory.

Mr. SANDLIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the time for general debate be equally divided this afternoon between the gentleman from North Dakota and myself, with no time set.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Louisiana to go into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the agricultural appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 8134, with Mr. GREGORY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. SANDLIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the first reading of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SANDLIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GILLESPIE].

Mr. GILLESPIE. Mr. Chairman, I am in hearty accord with the provisions of this bill, authorizing an appropriation of more than fifty-nine millions for the Department of Agriculture, the Farm Credit Administration, and for other purposes, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1935. I shall vote for it.

I have voted consistently and persistently for all the major bills, the administration bills enacted into law at the last special session and thus far at this regular session.

WELL-CONSIDERED PLAN

President Roosevelt, months before he was inducted into office, surrounded himself with skilled and able men and, in collaboration with them, formulated a well-considered plan for the Nation's recovery from its economic depression. Therefore, these major administration bills cannot be considered as separate and distinct measures. In the larger sense, and in their generic meaning, they must all be considered as one great omnibus bill, embodying various measures intended to bring about recovery—to restore prosperity.

SECRETARY WALLACE

Secretary Wallace said aptly and truly that 12 years of a lack of planning had created a national chaos, and for that reason it became necessary for Congress to pass many extraordinary emergency Federal laws.

CHAOS

The moneymongers and the exploiters of the Government had their way and have wrought this awful ruin. They have displayed their wares, and we know them. At no time in our dire distress have our money masters suggested any remedy or pointed any pathway out of the chaos.

NATION'S LEADER

President Roosevelt, the Nation's leader, formulated a plan and has blazed the way.

I have followed his leadership and have voted for every administration bill.

The majority of this House and the Senate have supported the plan.

NOT TIME TO ROCK THE BOAT

When the skipper has set the course and flung the sails to catch the breeze, it is no time to rock the boat. That is the time to pull together and to sail ahead until some serious obstacle appears. When such an obstacle rises on the horizon, then is the time to think about a new course and to argue with the skipper if he hesitates about setting out on a new course.

MAJORITY SO LARGE

I am against closed rules. The Democratic majority is so large that, in my judgment, there is no reason for bringing in such rules. The minority is so small that we of the majority can say to the minority what Job said to his comforters: "How long will ye vex my soul, and break me in pieces with words?" We will never do that, for many of the patriotic minority Members have supported the administration bills.

THE PROGRAM SUCCEEDING

What has been the effect on the country of the legislation passed by the Seventy-third Congress thus far?

It must be admitted that times have improved.

Before Congress convened in special session and these laws became effective, banks were all closed; now 90 percent of the banks are open, and on a sound basis. Bank deposits are guaranteed by the Federal Government.

Then farmers in the Corn Belt were getting as low as 10 cents a bushel for corn; now at least 45 cents.

Then the farmer was getting as low as 25 cents a bushel for his wheat; now 80 or 90 cents.

Then 6 cents a pound for cotton; now 12 cents.

The cost of electricity to the farmer and the public in many places is already greatly reduced, and this benefit will soon spread to the whole country as a result of the Government's operation of Muscle Shoals.

Fertilizer is cheaper on account of Muscle Shoals.

Before the Farm Mortgage Act and the Home Loan Act were passed, farmers and home owners were being foreclosed and driven out by the hundreds of thousands; now foreclosures are almost a thing of the past. It is out of fashion now to institute foreclosure suits. Money lenders and lawyers have adapted themselves to this new fashion.

Before the National Industrial Recovery Act was passed, there were at least 14,000,000 unemployed; now nearly 10,000,000 have been afforded work at fair wages.

Child labor is abolished in America forever.

SILVER FOR MONEY

Our obsolete monetary system has been reformed, and the fact has been impressed upon the public mind that three fourths of the world uses silver money.

The Economy Act has reduced expenditures of the Government a billion dollars.

RAILROADS

The Railroad Relief Act has helped the country's common carriers and the thousands of employees who earn their living in that line.

BLUE SKY LAW

The Securities Control Act has made it impossible for an Insull ever again to foist his spurious stocks upon an unsuspecting public and thereby rob the honest workers of their earnings, the small business men, the teachers in our schools, stenographers, clerks, and those who, in the evening of life, have retired to live upon tiny incomes.

REFORESTATION

The reforestation program has afforded employment to 300,000 young men in the C.C.C. camps, providing them food and shelter, in addition to money to be sent back home to keep the wolf from the doors of their dependents.

PRESENT SESSION MEASURES

At this session we have passed—

A bill guaranteeing the principal and interest of 2 billion farm-mortgage bonds.

A bill extending the life of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

STABILIZING MONEY—TWO BILLIONS

A bill transferring the gold from the Federal Reserve System to the Treasury Department, giving the Treasury two billions of new dollars as stabilizing money.

A bill appropriating nine hundred and fifty millions for C.W.A. and emergency relief, four hundred and fifty millions of which is to continue the C.W.A. until May 1.

These bills are all of the administration program.

PUBLIC ROADS

As a member of the Committee on Roads, I am glad this appropriation bill provides \$8,000,000 for highways, to continue the work we have begun in the various emergency acts.

The new highways that are being built throughout the country increase the permanent value of farm lands by bringing the farmer closer to the market, enabling him to get to town more easily, and making life pleasanter for the farmer and his family.

These highways are good for the towns, because they bring more trade to the merchants, and this great program of road building is enormously beneficial for the whole country. It also affords employment to thousands.

Time will not permit a further recital, but it should be said that the whole tendency of the administration program has been to take men from the highways and corners of the streets back to the land.

In prosperous times these men were wont to congregate in the cities, but when the bad times came they discovered that living comes from the land.

COLLAPSE WITHOUT A LEADER

Could we have gotten anywhere without a leader?

All do not agree as to every detail of the recovery plan; but can you envision what would have been our plight at this time if President Roosevelt had become discouraged because of adverse criticism and refused to lead further?

What if he had thrown it all back into the laps of the many discordant groups?

The result would have been utter confusion and collapse.

TWENTY-ONE MILLIONS TO VETERANS

I am glad that by Executive order President Roosevelt has given back to the veterans twenty-one millions to provide better hospitalization for the veterans and to restore a part of their compensation that was taken away by the Economy Act.

I can think of no better way to help these veterans and to contribute to the general welfare than by the distribution of this twenty-one millions for the benefit of the veterans who reside in every part of our country.

If a bill embodying the four-point program of the veterans is brought before this Congress, I shall vote for it, for the reason that money distributed to afford proper hospitalization and to compensate veterans for service-connected injuries is one of the best ways to put money back into the channels of trade, where its circulation will immediately be felt in the whole commercial world.

THE FARMER'S ECONOMIC IMPORTANCE

The agricultural group—those interested directly or indirectly in farming—comprises more than one third of our population of 120,000,000. At least 50,000,000 of our people are financially interested, directly or indirectly, in farming.

After the war was over and the time had come when there must be deflation, the industrial and financial leaders in the cities and even in country villages did not comprehend the importance of this great agricultural group in the economic and financial life of the Nation. For that reason the farmer was the first to be deflated and foreclosed. This was a tragic mistake because, comprising, as he does, the greatest single group and the most important in its relation to our financial, industrial, and social fabric, he should have been the last.

SO CLOSELY KNIT

So closely knit and interdependent are all of our economic enterprises that general prosperity must depend upon the welfare of the great majority.

There is no industry comparable in magnitude and financial importance to the farming industry.

RADIO CITY

You will recall that during the period of the highest-priced material, highest-priced labor, and highest-priced money the Rockefellers started the construction of the tremendous project known as "Radio City" in New York, a worthy undertaking, to cost millions upon millions of dollars. I am advised that the depression struck this project almost amidship and nearly wrecked it.

EMPIRE STATE BUILDING

At the same time the famous old Waldorf-Astoria Hotel was purchased, wrecked, and upon that ground there rose the marvelous Empire State Building, which today is one of the most notable structures on the Continent of North America. But I am told after it was finished the income derived from the rent of its offices and stores was not sufficient to pay even the interest on the first mortgage.

Did they realize that deflation of farm values had anything to do with this?

These incidents are cited as illustrations of the fact that even the wisest of our money changers did not understand the farmer's economic relation to gigantic city projects.

REASONS FOR FAILURE

I will tell you why the prosperity of the Nation depends primarily upon the prosperity of the farmer.

In the first place, I repeat, the farmer constitutes more than one third of the population of the country.

The farmer, in normal times, owns about one third of all the property in the United States; yet, while he receives only 10 percent of the national income, he pays 80 percent of all the taxes. He is therefore in normal times the chief taxpayer.

He is the exclusive support of all the country towns and villages, with their banks and local enterprises; and it requires little vision to see there would be no large cities and great industrial centers if it were not for the farmer.

He feeds the world and furnishes most of the raw material.

IF HE SHOULD STRIKE

Imagine, if you will, the tragedy to the Nation if the farmer should strike and refuse to function for the short period of 3 months. What would become of your great cities and your great manufacturing industries?

We speak most respectfully of skilled labor, as we should, but I call you to witness that the farmer is the sole expert in his line.

THE FARMER SOLE CUSTOMER

The farmer is the sole and only customer for thousands of manufactured articles. With him out of business, factories turning out farm labor forms would close forever, and hundreds of thousands of mechanics would be thrown out of employment.

BIGGEST BUYER OF IRON

Again, the farmer is the largest customer for and uses by far more iron and steel than all the railroads and transportation systems of our country.

SOLE BUYER

To illustrate, he is the sole and only customer in the market for silos, mowing machines, self-binders, tractors, plows, disks, harrows, hayracks, farm wagons, nearly all harness and saddles, threshing machines, corn shellers, hay loaders, fencing wire, fence stretchers, and thousands of other articles of equipment and machinery exclusively used on the farms—and nowhere else.

Without the farmer the factories that make these implements would close, and it is difficult to imagine what would become of the thousands of workers in these factories, in the mines, and in transportation systems.

GREATEST CONSUMER OF COMMODITIES

He is the greatest consumer of basic commodities in the Nation.

Without the farmer for a patron, what would become of the railroads, our merchant marine, and great transportation systems, which carry to every part of the world grains, foods of all kinds, textile goods, manufactured articles, as well as the raw materials that come from the farm.

BUYER OF NECESSITIES AND LUXURIES

Not only does the farmer purchase all manufactured articles that he alone uses but he is the major customer for the necessities of life and the luxuries as well. He drives an automobile and buys more gasoline than any other man. He has carpets on all his floors. He has painted houses and homes. He and his family embody the pride and good taste and culture of the American people. Publishers tell us that the farmer furnishes two thirds of the subscriptions to all the periodicals in the United States. Motion-picture theater managers tell us that the farmer and his family contribute 75 percent of the attendance that supports the motion-picture industry. His home is equipped with the telephone, the electric light, the radio, and the talking machine. The farmer is the greatest consumer of all manufactured articles.

CRIME AGAINST AGRICULTURE

Since industry and industrial workers must look to the farm to find the greatest group customer of the banks, the railroads, the steel industry, and all other industries, I assert that the fact that the farmer was picked out as the first victim of deflation was the most incredible as well as the greatest crime that has been committed in the economic field during the last half century for the reason that it ruined not only the farmer but affected every industry and industrial worker. [Applause.]

DEPRESSION ON

The moment he was deflated the depression must soon arrive, for the reason the farmer must sink into bankruptcy and be foreclosed because the market value of his products had been destroyed.

SHORT-SIGHTEDNESS

With the same short-sightedness in their greed and blindness, demanding higher and higher tariff walls, the call of the selfish interests was answered and they raised the tariff so high that foreign countries erected against us retaliatory tariff walls and shut out our grains, cotton, and farm products, and thereby destroyed the market for our farm surplus. [Applause.]

ALCOHOL MOTOR FUEL BLEND PLAN

At the special session of this Congress I introduced H.R. 1744, on the alcohol motor fuel blend plan, and I have introduced a similar bill at this session.

If enacted into law it will afford the farmer a market for all of his surplus products.

This country uses approximately 17,000,000,000 gallons of motor fuel annually.

To produce sufficient alcohol for this blend with gasoline it would require one fourth of the corn crop, 680,000,000 bushels of corn, or 750,000,000 bushels of wheat. Slightly more alcohol can be produced from a bushel of corn than from a bushel of wheat.

Advocating this measure I said, in substance, on the floor of the House that with this measure in operation the farmer would have no surplus corn or wheat. I pointed out that it would require 680,000,000 bushels of corn to produce sufficient alcohol to make the required blend, and that 176,000,000 bushels of corn was the greatest surplus we had ever sent to foreign markets. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ARNOLD. I yield the gentleman from Illinois 15 additional minutes.

DOMESTIC MARKET

Mr. GILLESPIE. This would give the farmer a domestic market for all he would produce on all of his lands in use. He would not be concerned any more about retaliatory tariffs.

BETTER GASOLINE

The quality of this mixture of alcohol with gasoline has been tested with automobiles driven on the highways and on tractor engines drawing heavy loads, and it has been proven to be a better motor fuel than any combination in use.

The same kind of gasoline, produced from similar agricultural products, has been used in foreign countries for many years to the profit of the farmer. For this reason, in France and in Germany, wheat will sell for nearly \$3 a bushel, while the American farmer has been getting as low as 25 cents a bushel for his wheat and as low as 10 cents for corn.

Factories to manufacture this alcohol blend would furnish employment to 300,000 men and women. [Applause.]

CORN BORER

I appreciate that this bill includes an appropriation for \$30,411 for the control of the European corn borer. This pest is a menace to all the farmers of the Corn Belt. It has made inroads, not only in Illinois but in Ohio, Indiana, Wisconsin, Michigan, and, in fact, is rapidly spreading to the Southeast and the West.

The entomologists of the Government tell us that effective quarantines must be established, parasites must be imported, and other measures must be adopted to arrest the danger and to introduce some measure of control.

It is very necessary, under present conditions, that we do everything possible to prevent the recurrence of the condition that obtained in Ontario, when nine tenths of the corn crop was destroyed by this pest.

WET-WEATHER PEST

The Corn Belt would have suffered more, no doubt, but for the fact that the last 3 years have been extremely dry

years, and if they should now be followed by wet years the danger will be multiplied, because the corn borer works in wet weather. [Applause.]

SOIL EROSION

My constituents will be pleased to know that this bill includes a substantial appropriation for the prevention of soil erosion. Like the farmers of other regions we have suffered great losses by erosion.

We know the annual loss of soil in the United States on account of erosion is equal to all the tillable soil used by the people of Japan.

Seventy-five percent of all the soil in the United States is seriously jeopardized by erosion.

The Mississippi River each year carries away 418,000,000 tons of the fertile top soil of the Mississippi Valley.

Soil washed away over a period of 3 to 10 years can be replaced only during the slow passage of from 300 to 1,000 years. We favor every effort that is made by the Government to prevent this destruction by the system of planting and reforestation and other proper and scientific means.

FIRST PRESIDENT TO RECOGNIZE FARMER

This is the first national administration that has ever whole-heartedly recognized the farmer and his problem. I am honored to have the opportunity of cooperating with the President, and, in my judgment, he is the first President in recent years who has fully comprehended the importance of agriculture in its relation to the whole economic structure and who in practice has strikingly demonstrated his appreciation of the importance of agriculture as well as his consciousness of its significance to industry.

I shall continue to vote, in office or out, for the principle of a "new deal"—justice to the farmer, the working man, the plain people.

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee, I appreciate this opportunity to express some of my views on this great farm question.

In the time allotted it is impossible to cover any of these points as fully as they deserve, because the problem is so great in magnitude and so important to the welfare of this whole country that, however much our hearts and minds are in the subject, it is impossible to comprehend the necessity of helping the farming industry. If it does not succeed and prosper, there can be no general prosperity in America. When this industry is brought back to prosperity, or even a reasonable degree of prosperity, America will again be in the front line marching on to greater opportunity and better citizenship for every individual under the American flag.

CARNEGIE AND GLADSTONE

Many years ago Andrew Carnegie told the story of a visit to his old home in Scotland. While over there, he was visited by Gladstone, who was in fine form and great spirits because England had just completed the construction of the greatest navy in the world. Gladstone twitted Carnegie by saying, "Andrew, we now have enough ships to blockade every port of your proud United States." Carnegie replied, "Just lay your blockade whenever you are ready, and if the blockade extends over 2 weeks, Great Britain will starve to death, because, you know, you have just enough agricultural products in Great Britain to last your country 2 weeks, and your greatest source of food, after all, is the United States."

UNFAIR DIVISION OF INCOME

There is nothing wrong with the form of our Government. But inequality and injustice have been caused by maladministration of the Government.

Five hundred and four privileged gentlemen in 1929 received a net income of more than one billion, while the gross income of the whole fifty millions interested in agriculture did not equal the net income of these 504 privileged gentlemen.

That there has been something wrong in the administration of the Government all must admit.

How long could a government endure administered so unjustly and permitting such inequalities in the economic field?

All of the acts of this Congress have been intended to bring about fair play and to bring back to the people again equal opportunity to all. [Applause.]

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILLESPIE. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. I should have interrupted the gentleman when he made the statement that the farmer was the greatest user of iron and steel products in America, using more than the railroads and other industries that he mentioned.

Mr. GILLESPIE. I might answer the gentleman very quickly. I got that information from the World Almanac.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. That is the most astounding statement I have heard made in the House during this session. I do not believe the country has the remotest conception of the facts involved in it, and when the gentleman extends his remarks in the RECORD, if he has any statistics establishing the facts, I think all the Members would appreciate having them inserted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GILLESPIE] has expired.

Mr. SINCLAIR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF].

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Chairman, coming from an agricultural district comprised of 14 agricultural counties, I naturally was very much interested in the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GILLESPIE], who has just preceded me. I agree with him in many of the statements he has made. I will go still farther than he has gone in one respect, and that is to say that every shred of prosperity which comes to the man in the city is based primarily upon the prosperity and well-being of the man who lives on the farm.

Mr. Chairman, my remarks will be addressed to the proposals incorporated in H.R. 7907, now under consideration by the House Committee on Agriculture, a bill to include sugar beets and sugar cane as basic agricultural commodities under the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and for other purposes.

Much as I regret it I find myself in emphatic opposition to the administration in the fundamentals which underlie this question, and I wish at the outset, Mr. Chairman, to state my reasons for this opposition. You will recall that in his message of February 8, in discussing the American sugar industry, the President said in part—

I do not at this time recommend placing sugar on the free list.

If this indicates anything, it indicates that this is one of the possibilities he has in mind in connection with this very important industry.

On February 19, Mr. A. J. S. Weaver, chief of the sugar section of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, in his testimony before the House Committee on Agriculture intimated very clearly that he considered this expression of the President in his message to be an intimation that sugar might later be put on the free list by a succession of moves which would reduce the great shock. I am inserting at the end of my remarks the testimony referred to.

The Secretary of Agriculture, Hon. Henry A. Wallace, as I shall show in detail in a few moments, has been quoted publicly as stating that he believes the American domestic sugar industry is a hothouse industry and should never have been established. In fact, in an article just released entitled "America Must Choose", the Secretary of Agriculture declares as follows in discussing a program which appeals to him for the rehabilitation of agriculture and industry in the United States:

This will involve a radical reduction in tariffs that might seriously hurt certain industries and a few kinds of agricultural businesses, such as sugar-beet growing and flax growing. It might also cause pain for a while to woolgrowers and to farmers who supply material for various edible oils. I think we ought to face that fact.

Now if we are going to lower tariffs radically there may have to be definite planning whereby certain industries or businesses will have to be retired. The Government might have to help furnish means for the orderly retirement of such businesses, and even select those which are thus to be retired.

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

Mr. WOODRUFF. I yield.

Mr. BLANCHARD. Was it not originally contemplated that the sugar refining would be done in the United States?

Mr. WOODRUFF. It has always been so contemplated, but due to the fact that in the recent tariff bills the differential in the tariff between the raw sugar and the refined sugar was not great enough to protect the refining-sugar industry, the refining industry of the island of Cuba has grown from approximately 5,000 tons per year to more than a half million tons, and is now challenging the success and the life, really, of the refining industry within the United States.

On February 20 Prof. Rexford G. Tugwell, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, in his testimony before the House Committee on Agriculture, made the statement, in effect, that he "would not extend protection to any industry that could not stand on its own two feet." As any industry which could stand on its own two feet would not need protection, it is obvious what the professor would do to the whole protective-tariff system if he could have his way.

These three gentlemen will have complete supervision of the administration of this proposed program if it is enacted.

Mr. Chairman, I want it clearly understood that I am not leveling personal criticism at the President of the United States or at any other official of the administration, because this is not a matter of personalities; it is a matter of the gravest and most vital economic fundamentals concerning the welfare of every man, woman, and child in the United States. Therefore, my opposition is not an opposition to persons but an opposition to a plan which I think it is perfectly clear, from the expressions I have just quoted, is the first step in a program which, if carried out, will result in the extermination of the vitally important American sugar industry. Nor do I believe, Mr. Chairman, that the President or any of the three gentlemen referred to are in any way influenced by the vicious propaganda fed the people of the United States for many years by a self-interested group, which I shall discuss at length later.

I will go further and say that I do not believe the President of the United States, notwithstanding the reports that he has yielded somewhat since sending his message on the question to Congress, yet realizes fully what the effect of this program will be, not alone upon American farmers, American laboring men, American capital, but upon the American consumers as well. And it is in the hope that by friendly, though emphatic, criticism that both the administration and the general public can be brought to see what the actual ruinous results of this contemplated step will be if it is followed out.

As I understand it, here is what the program comprehends: The legislation introduced in both the House and Senate, at the suggestion of the President, asks that sugar be made by law one of the so-called "basic agricultural commodities." This legislation proposes to turn over to the Secretary of Agriculture which of course, means to Professor Tugwell and Mr. Weaver as well, power to regulate production through allotments of tonnage to the producers of the United States, the producers of our insular possessions, and the producers of the Philippines and Cuba.

We learn through various sources, including the President's message, that if this legislation, as it was introduced becomes the law, the production of beet sugar in the United States will immediately be reduced by something like 300,000 tons and the Cuban allotment be increased in like amount. It is proposed also to reduce the tariff by approximately one half cent per pound and to collect a processing tax upon all sugar manufactured in this country.

To us who are familiar with the activities down the years of those engaged in the production of sugar in Cuba, looking to the destruction of the American domestic industry, the proposal of the administration very clearly indicates that, if adopted, the complete destruction of the domestic-sugar industry will eventually follow. The adoption of this bill, as introduced, will be the first successful step to this end.

I find myself in disagreement with this part of the administration's program, first because, among other things, instead of cheapening the price of sugar to the consumers of the United States, it will inevitably place them again at the mercy of those who, in 1920, when there was no domestic sugar available for the market, robbed the American housewives of several hundred million dollars by pegging the price as high as 32 cents a pound to the consumer.

I am satisfied that the President is ill advised, and I voice my criticism as one who puts love of country above partisanship in a sincere effort to warn this administration of what it actually will do to the sugar industry, the farmers, and the sugar consumers of this country if this program is carried out. I believe that since the destinies of this Nation have been so wholly and completely entrusted to the present Chief Executive that it is the duty of every Member of Congress and every citizen of the United States to aid him by constructive criticism and suggestions, and it is for this purpose that I present the facts in this analysis of what this administration program really means.

Let me say at this point, Mr. Chairman, that not only does the small group of financial interests, centered principally in New York and on the eastern seaboard, control practically the whole of the Cuban sugar industry, but I assert without fear of successful contradiction that these same interests have for years sought to destroy the American sugar producing industry. Many individuals of this same group have profited not alone from sugar, but they have taken tribute from air-mail and ocean-mail subsidies, from the sale of watered and spurious stocks, and from profiteering in other operations. And they now demand that rehabilitation of their investments in Cuba be made at the expense of the American farmer, American labor, and the American consumer.

I ask you, Mr. Chairman, under what concept of fair and just government can the American farmers who grow sugar beets, and who can grow enough sugar beets to supply the entire domestic demand, the American capital invested in sugar production in this country, the American consumers and the whole body of our people, be asked to subsidize again, and in greater measure than ever, this same group which has piled up its ill-gotten millions from subsidies, corruption in which today is being disclosed. We have come, Mr. Chairman, to that day, which was foreseen by many of us, when the most vociferous supporters of the American tariff system have turned upon it because they were disloyal enough to their country and blind enough in their greed to transfer the money they made in this country from the sweat of American labor to foreign countries.

Hundreds of millions of dollars have been invested in Cuban sugar plantations and mills by this little group of eastern financiers. Every job held by a low-wage foreign laborer in the Cuban sugar industry means one less job at higher wages for the American working man. Every pound of sugar raised in the Tropics and sold in this country means one pound less of profitable sugar that may be raised by the American farmer. This means—and I cannot believe that the Chief Executive has studied this phase of the question—another step in the process which has been undertaken by American financiers who have expatriated their dollars to Cuba and other foreign countries of subjecting the American working masses, including the American farmers, to low-wage competition, which can mean in the end only peonage and serfdom for our people.

If this proposal affecting sugar is enacted, these international industrialists will make it the opening wedge in breaking down our protective tariff system completely, and we will see the day when the American markets will be invaded by the cheap foreign-made goods, made in foreign factories with underpaid foreign labor and financed by American dollars, in order that the same crowd of despoilers may gather still more wealth while Americans starve in unemployment. May it be said here and now that this is not a partisan question, because the disciples of the dollar mark give allegiance to no party.

Probably the most notable example of attempts to destroy the domestic industry and break down tariff protection now given to the American workingman and the American farmer has been in the machinations of the American financial group centered around the National City Bank and other large financial institutions of the eastern seaboard, holding vast sugar interests in Cuba. The investment of American dollars in sugar production in that island amounts to approximately \$800,000,000, and this group has gone to extreme lengths, not only to defeat the protective tariff on sugar but to control the American market through the absolute destruction of our domestic industry.

Why, Mr. Chairman, have we so soon forgotten the revelations before the Caraway lobby investigation committee held in 1930, in which Herbert C. Lakin, representing the United States Sugar Association, and the officials of the Cuban and American Chamber of Commerce of Cuba, admitted under oath that his organizations had furnished money to foreign lobbyists for the purpose of sabotaging the American sugar industry.

Probably in no instance is the psychology of that group of Americans who seem to know no country, no race, and no creed but the doctrine of "get" so clearly shown forth as in this international sugar group. I wish now, Mr. Chairman, to deal in detail with what I assert will be the results of this program if it should be carried into effect.

The President in his message made it clear that he believes that the administration's program regarding sugar will result in a saving to the American sugar consumer. Why, Mr. Chairman, nothing is more clear or better proved in this good hour than that without domestic competition, foreign sugar is incapable of price control. That was clearly demonstrated in 1920. It has also been proved on other occasions. Every housewife of that day will long remember that so-called "sugar debauch" when the Cuban sugar interests—and by that I mean American-owned Cuban sugar interests—raised their raw-sugar price from 5½ cents per pound to 23½ cents per pound within a few months, and finally compelled the American consumer to pay 32 cents per pound for this necessary food product, merely because the domestic supply had been exhausted and the Cuban supply dominated the American market.

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

Mr. WOODRUFF. I yield.

Mr. WEIDEMAN. In other words, in protecting Cuban sugar we are protecting the American capital invested in that industry in the island of Cuba and bringing the Cuban refiners into competition with refiners in this country.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Yes; together with bringing into competition Cuban farmers and workers with American farmers and workers.

Mr. WEIDEMAN. It is just the same as sending our marines down to Nicaragua. We sent a lot of our boys down there where they had no business to be, and more of them were killed than the number of mail pilots who lost their lives in the Air Service last week.

Mr. WOODRUFF. I may say to the gentleman from Michigan that if I had my way, neither the marines nor the Army nor the Navy would be sent to any part of this world to protect anything other than American lives.

Mr. WEIDEMAN. I agree with the gentleman.

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

Mr. WOODRUFF. I yield.

Mr. REILLY. Has the gentleman any figures or statistics showing the ratio between our beet-sugar production, our cane-sugar production, and the total consumption of sugar in this country?

Mr. WOODRUFF. The domestic production of our beet and cane sugar is approximately one third our consumption of these products.

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

Mr. WOODRUFF. I yield.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. I do not like to interrupt the gentleman, but a few moments ago he said something about

contributing to the rehabilitation of Cuba. Were not those words used in the special message the President sent to the Committee on Agriculture asking for the passage of this legislation?

Mr. WOODRUFF. If I recall correctly, they were. I may say to the gentleman from Ohio that I shall deal directly with that question at some length later.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. I am more concerned about the rehabilitation of the United States at this time than I am about the rehabilitation of Cuba. [Applause.]

Mr. WOODRUFF. I propose to show later that, if this plan is carried into effect, we will wreck a most important American agricultural industry without in the slightest degree affecting the market we previously had in Cuba and without contributing in any degree to the welfare or prosperity of the Cuban people. Whatever of prosperity accrues to anyone as a result of an increased importation of Cuban sugar to this market accrues to the Americans who own the sugar industry of that country. I am told on good authority that, of every dollar spent for this Cuban product, 80 cents is forwarded to this country for the benefit of the owners and only 20 cents remain to benefit the Cuban people.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a brief question?

Mr. WOODRUFF. Certainly.

Mr. DONDERO. Will the gentleman compare the amount of American-produced sugar with the total amount consumed in this country? I think the Membership would like to have this information.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Continental United States produces a little less than one third of the total amount of sugar we consume.

Keep in mind that the identical interests who perpetrated the atrocious piece of piracy upon the American consumers in 1920 are exactly the same interests that control the Cuban sugar industry today and which will control that industry when the beet-sugar industry has been destroyed. They represent in numerous instances the same individuals who have participated in the piracies in air mail, ocean mail, aircraft manufacturing, stock jobbing, and bank speculation upon the American people.

It is difficult to understand the psychology of any group of Americans who actually would be willing to do what this group did in this instance. Why, Mr. Chairman, it was reported in the press, at that time, that the Cuban-American producers had formed a pool to hold some four or five hundred thousand tons of sugar off the market until the price of 30 cents a pound for raw sugar would be obtained. This utterly indefensible conduct on the part of the Cuban-American interests was made possible only after the domestic beet and cane crop had become exhausted. How many experiences of that sort do we need to demonstrate to us that a successful and expanding American domestic-sugar industry means a reasonable price to the consumer instead of a high price, as the President has been led to believe?

Why, Mr. Chairman, what man is there within the sound of my voice who for a moment questions what would be the result if this group should again control the American sugar market? What man or woman within the sound of my voice doubts for a moment what the result will be if foreign sugar producers are able to destroy the domestic industry and then set the price that they would charge the American citizen for his sugar? This illustration I have given is the test of what will happen. Why, do you know, Mr. Chairman, that the sum wrung from the pockets of the American consumers in that one sugar debauch was more than sufficient to erect enough beet-sugar factories in this country to supply our entire requirements? This levy placed upon American consumers by those in control of the Cuban sugar industry was greater than the duty collected on all sugar imported from Cuba in the following 5 years.

I ask this, my friends, in whose hands the sugar interests are safest? Would the domination of our sugar production be safer in the hands of a foreign industry, controlled by a group of financially powerful Americans who have proved themselves repeatedly, whenever an opportunity presented

itself, willing to gouge and despoil the American people of hundreds of millions of dollars, or would it be safer in the hands of the American workingman, the American farmers, the American people, who have their money invested in American industry, which gives employment to American labor and American farmers; which distributes its earnings among the American people, and which pays Federal, State, and local taxes?

Is there anybody who doubts that Cuba can produce sugar at lower cost than almost any other country in the world, and that without adequate tariff protection it would be a matter of only a short time before the domestic industry would become history? Unless the protection now thrown around the American sugar industry is continued, there is not the slightest doubt that the domestic industry must surrender to this foreign industry. If we do this thing, Mr. Chairman, what is to happen to the more than 100,000 American farmers to whom the sugar beet is the only crop upon which they can reasonably count a profit when the seed is planted?

What is to happen to that farmer who shares in the net proceeds from the sale of the sugar and byproducts manufactured from his beets? What is to happen to the industry that gives employment to tens of thousands of farm laborers during the growing and harvesting season? What is to happen to the thousands of technicians, mechanics, and executives in and about the factories? What is to happen to the millions of tons of beets grown on more than 1,000,000 acres of American land? What is to happen to this American farm crop raised on American soil valued at over \$200,000,000, every one of which are distributed to American farmers, American labor, and American industry? What is to happen to the annual freight bill of from \$30,000,000 to \$35,000,000 paid to the railroads? What is to happen to \$20,000,000 worth of supplies, such as machinery, coal, coke, lime rock, chemicals—all products of American industry—which are used in the sugar production in this country? What is to happen to the thousands of employees of these industries? What is to happen, aside from all these considerations, to what may be classed as contingent insurance to the consumer against high prices, as represented in the American continental beet and cane sugar industry?

We never fully appreciate the value, Mr. Chairman, of such an insurance policy until the emergency occurs, and then its benefits stand out in bold relief; and so it is with this most important sugar industry. When plenty of sugar is available and the price is low little thought is given to the economic value of the industry by the public; but when emergencies arise as in 1911, 1917, 1920, and at other times, the value of producing on American soil a sufficient quantity of this necessary food commodity to at least stabilize the price is seen—and I warn this administration and the country, that if the domestic sugar industry is destroyed, as it will eventually be destroyed if this policy is put into effect, we will discover to our sorrow and to our gigantic financial sacrifice that the industry cannot be rehabilitated to meet an emergency, which may cut off our supply from the foreign producers, or to protect us from exploitation by those foreign producers.

If this program is put into effect, Mr. Chairman, what is to happen to California and her 8 sugar-beet plants, to Colorado and her 18 plants, to Idaho and her 9 plants, to Indiana and her 1 plant, to Iowa and her 3 plants, to Kansas and her 1 plant, to my State of Michigan and its 16 plants, to Minnesota and her 2 plants, to Montana and her 4 plants, to Nebraska and her 7 plants, to Nevada with 1 plant, to Ohio with 5 plants, to South Dakota with 1 plant, to Utah with 15 plants, to Washington with 1 plant, to Wisconsin with 3 plants, to Wyoming with 5 plants? And what is to happen to the farmers of these States who are raising these millions of tons of sugar beets? What is to happen to the employees of these plants? To what shall the 1,000,000 of the most productive and fertile acres we have, which are now used for the growing of beets, be devoted? Shall they be used for the production of those crops of which we now raise an overabundance, or shall

they be used to produce exportable surpluses of still other American crops?

Why, Mr. Chairman, we are engaged on the one hand in spending millions of the people's money for experts to teach the American farmer how to raise more and better crops on his land, and on the other we are spending many more millions to reward the farmer for not planting those crops of which we raise an exportable surplus. We are here seriously considering reducing and ultimately destroying one American farm crop of which we are not producing enough to more than stabilize the price, of what the President says is one of the basic American commodities.

Mr. Chairman, in the name of all that is intelligent, what reason is there, in the effort to return American prosperity, for not fostering and expanding the American domestic sugar industry, rather than decreasing and destroying it? Does anyone for a moment imagine that these hundreds of thousands of acres, now devoted to the growing of sugar beets, will not have to be turned to the production of some other crops, if sugar beets cannot be grown? Any soil that is used for growing sugar beets must necessarily be high in productivity and of fine quality. There is not a single acre of it that can be termed marginal land, and not an acre that should be taken out of production.

As I have just stated, more than a million acres of farm lands now devoted to sugar-beet culture will be devoted to the growing of other crops which are already surfeiting the market; hundreds of thousands of farmers will be deprived of a remunerative cash crop; hundreds of prosperous farming communities, which owe their prosperity to the establishment of beet-sugar factories in their midst, will be deprived of these benefits; scores of thousands of farmers who today use the money they receive for their sugar beets to pay their taxes, which, without such money, could not be paid during these times, will face eviction and ruin. It is the one crop upon which the American farmer can safely count a profit when he plants his seed. For that reason it is without question the most valuable crop that any farmer raises in any beet-sugar producing section of this country.

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

Mr. WOODRUFF. I yield.

Mr. THURSTON. Having in mind the present policy of paying bounties to farmers to withdraw their corn and cotton lands from cultivation, and the bounties to be paid to the producers of wheat for a like purpose, what will be the effect of the withdrawal of the land now devoted to the culture of sugar beets and its entry into competition with the corn and wheat land of the country?

Mr. WOODRUFF. It will either enter into competition with other basic commodities or it will mean that more than a million acres of the most fertile land now utilized in the raising of sugar beets will be taken out of production entirely; and this, in my judgment, will not happen because of the high quality of the land. I shall deal more fully with this subject later.

Mr. THURSTON. Anyhow, it is obviously an inconsistent policy to pay for the withdrawal of land from the production of one crop only to have the land used in the acceleration of another crop.

Mr. WOODRUFF. It is the height of inconsistency.

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

Mr. WOODRUFF. I yield.

Mr. GLOVER. I am interested in the gentleman's speech. I am on the Committee on Agriculture, which for several days has been holding hearings on this subject, and has heard the subject discussed by experts. Can the gentleman inform the House how much land would be taken out of cultivation under the proposed allotment to the cane and beet growers of the United States and our island possessions, and the letting in of refined sugar under the 2-cent tariff?

Mr. WOODRUFF. The minimum would be a reduction of approximately 20 percent, or 200,000 acres.

Mr. GLOVER. Two hundred thousand acres will be taken out of production?

Mr. WOODRUFF. Yes; but the matter of greatest importance is the fact that the administration at this time proposes to embark upon a program which will eventually utterly destroy the continental beet-sugar industry.

Mr. GLOVER. I heartily agree with the gentleman. I should like to see these emergency remedies and methods, in the matter of curtailment of crops, applied to the commodities of which a surplus is produced—for instance, cotton and wheat. Inasmuch as there is no surplus of sugar, since we grow only one third of the amount we consume, I do not see the consistency of curtailing the production of sugar beets and cane.

Mr. WOODRUFF. There is not the slightest consistency in such action. The principle of curtailment should be applied only to those crops of which we raise an exportable surplus.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SINCLAIR. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 15 additional minutes.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Chairman, if this industry could only receive the encouragement and the protection that would justify its expansion to the point where we could in this country raise the sugar we consume, or the greater part of it, it would, at least partially, solve the farm problem that has for the past few years been distracting and threatening this country. Agriculture—and all of it, whether engaged in the raising of sugar beets or not—would receive direct and substantial benefit from this expansion. And yet, Mr. Chairman, we are here seriously considering the curtailment and the eventual destruction of this great American industry. Do the American people want to bring about such an economic cataclysm? Do we wish to abandon an important American industry, producing a necessary food commodity, in order that a small group of greedy Americans may exploit the consumers of this country? I do not believe so; I cannot be persuaded that the President of the United States would for a moment countenance such a possibility if he understood the real facts.

Why, Mr. Chairman, in opposing an increase of the duty on sugar in 1930 the great financial interests in Wall Street in their propaganda stressed the fact that they had nearly a billion dollars invested in the Cuban sugar industry and that such an increase in the tariff would be detrimental to these foreign investments.

I do not contend that American capital invested in a foreign country should not receive consideration by our Government. I do take the position, however, that money invested in this country, bearing its share of the tax burden, the turnover of which energizes American farmers and American industry and American labor, should receive first consideration. If it be true that American capital invested in the Cuban sugar industry should be protected, it must then also be true that American capital invested in the American continental beet- and cane-sugar industry should receive more protection.

Why, Mr. Chairman, we have already extended protection to American capital invested in Cuban industries by the 20-percent preferential in the tariff law, and these rapacious interests are not satisfied with that. When American capital is invested and employed in exploiting a foreign industry which, by reason of cheap labor and low costs of production, is able to flood this country with a cheap commodity, forcing the reduction of wages and living standards of Americans to the wages and living standards of a tropical country, and working to the utter annihilation of a great American industry, such American capital invested in foreign countries is not deserving of the slightest consideration.

Why, the very group which has come to Congress asking that we must not be at the mercy of any foreign government in the matter of ships; that it is vital for a nation like ours to not be dependent upon any foreign source of supply for anything, and upon that argument has wrung from the United States Treasury its millions in ocean mail subsidies, is composed in part of the very same group which argues that we should render ourselves as quickly as possible wholly

dependent upon a foreign source of supply for a basic food commodity—sugar.

Without quoting the arguments made in the propaganda broadcast throughout the country by the powerful Wall Street financial group, I want to touch upon another point which seems to me to be important and upon which I touched awhile ago when I stated that this would be the opening wedge to break down the protection of every variety of industry in this country and open wide the doors for the influx of cheap foreign-made goods, manufactured by American dollars, to be brought into competition with the American producer and the American farmer and the American workingman.

Mr. MOTT. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. MOTT. Do I understand it is the gentleman's opinion that the President does not understand this, that he does not know what he is doing, and that this is just a matter of somebody giving him bad advice?

Mr. WOODRUFF. Well, I want to be fair.

Mr. MOTT. I want to be fair, too, and that is the reason I am asking the question.

Mr. WOODRUFF. It is my opinion that the President does not understand this question. You and I and every other Member of this House knows that every President of the United States is a busy man. His time is completely taken up by problems that confront him from day to day. He does not have time to go fully into many of the propositions that he personally must pass upon, and necessarily he must depend upon advisers. I believe, in connection with this matter, that the President is surrounded by a group of high-grade but misguided men who have advised him to advocate this program. I have respect for a man who honestly differs with me on matters of this kind, but may I say that these men who will administer the act if this program goes into effect are men who, if we are to believe what they say, are convinced the best place to buy is in the cheapest market, wherever in this wide world this market may be. I am not in harmony with this sort of program.

Mr. MOTT. I am glad to have the gentleman's opinion. Frankly I do not agree with him that the President does not understand the sugar proposal he is now offering to the Congress. I believe the President does understand this or he would not undertake to present Congress with such an important proposition. And I believe the responsibility should be placed where it belongs. May I ask the gentleman another question? Does the gentleman think this proposal of the administration is inconsistent in any way with the Democratic tariff theory as declared in the Democratic platform, namely, competitive tariffs for revenue and reciprocal trade agreements? Is not this sugar quota policy in line with that platform declaration on the tariff question?

Mr. WOODRUFF. It is unfortunate that this seems to be the case. May I say in connection with what I had to say about the President realizing what is proposed under this program: I am doing the best I can, and I know a number of other Members of this House from sugar-producing sections of the country are doing the best they can to bring the facts to the attention of the President of the United States.

Mr. MOTT. I quite agree with the gentleman. What I object to, if I may call it that, is not putting the responsibility where it belongs, and I think we would get further if we would quit camouflaging in this regard.

Mr. WOODRUFF. That may be so, but may I say to the gentlemen, and I say this advisedly because I believe it, that I think the President of the United States is doing the job that he has on his hands in the best way he knows how. I believe President Roosevelt is an honest man, and that he is prompted by a desire to be as helpful as possible to the American people.

Mr. MOTT. I believe that too. Do not misunderstand me. But in this sugar quota proposal I believe he is wrong.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Will the gentleman allow me to proceed? I know that after all the water is over the wheel the President himself must accept the responsibility for any-

thing that transpires under his administration. He will be held responsible for anything he does, whether it is good or bad, whether it affects the people of the United States beneficially or otherwise. He must answer to the people of this country when next he goes before them for election. That is his responsibility and no man can take the responsibility from him.

Mr. MOTT. There is no doubt about the gentleman's statement. It is simply that I do not agree with his suggestion that the President would put such an important proposal before Congress and not know what it was about or not know what effect it is going to have on the sugar industry.

Mr. WOODRUFF. I think he has been advised by men who do not understand or who perhaps unconsciously have closed their eyes to the fact that the one thing of the greatest importance to the people of this country is to continue to have the privilege of enjoying American standards of living, and under the theory outlined in this bill this is impossible. I agree with the gentleman that on a question as important as this the President should not have given it his approval without having all the facts before him. Had this been the case I cannot believe we would have had the bill before us at this time.

Mr. DONDERO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUFF. I yield to my friend from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Can the gentleman inform the House what justification there is for reducing this American industry? I think this is what we all want to know.

Mr. WOODRUFF. May I say to the gentleman that if I could find a reason which would justify the proposed action I would not be here speaking to the question. I would be sitting in my seat listening. I am in direct disagreement with this program. I am in as violent disagreement as it is possible for a man to be, because, among other things, I believe as thoroughly as I believe anything that upon the preservation of this industry rests much of the future success of American agriculture, and whether or not in the years to come the people of this country, the consuming public, are going to have the privilege of buying sugar at a reasonable price.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it has been argued by these financial racketeers that we should purchase our sugar from Cuba because that country can produce sugar so much cheaper than the United States. This is simply the application of the now worn-out theory of buying in the cheapest markets. If that program were followed as a sound theory of economics, we would buy our beef from the Argentine; we would buy our wheat from the Argentine, Canada, and Australia; we would buy our wool and mutton from Australia; we would buy our shoes from Czechoslovakia; we would buy our coal from England; we would buy our dairy products from Australia, New Zealand, and Denmark; we would buy our beans and peas from Japan; we would buy our pork products from Denmark; we would buy our tomatoes from Mexico, our onions from Spain; we would get our figs in Smyrna; and—this should interest you Members from the South—we would buy our cotton from India and Egypt; we would buy our cheese from Italy and Denmark and Ireland; we would buy our machinery and cutlery from Great Britain and Germany; and so on ad infinitum. And, by so doing, we would surrender once and for all the thing that has brought more peace, comfort, and happiness to the American people than anything else you can call to mind, and that is the American standard of living. And, further, we would surrender that splendid capacity for self-containment which, together with thousands of miles of salt water on the eastern, southern, and western borders, places us in a peculiar position on this globe for security, prosperity, peace, and happiness. In these hectic days, when every nation in the world is becoming self-sustaining as rapidly as possible, these facts are certainly of grave importance.

Mr. BLANCHARD. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. BLANCHARD. There would then be no tariff.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Naturally, because this bill is the opening step to that end.

Mr. THURSTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUFF. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. THURSTON. The gentleman from Michigan is familiar with the Nation-wide organization that has for its slogan "America self-contained"?

Mr. WOODRUFF. Yes.

Mr. THURSTON. This organization is promoting the use of American-produced products, whether it be the factory or the farm.

Mr. WOODRUFF. I am thoroughly familiar with the organization.

Mr. THURSTON. This policy would be in conflict with their proposal?

Mr. WOODRUFF. Very decidedly. May I say in that connection that anyone who closes his eyes to the fact that every country in the world today is becoming self-contained just as rapidly as possible is closing his eyes to a very obvious fact? [Applause.] Every nation in this world today is bringing about conditions within its borders where they can at the earliest possible time produce everything its people consume and need. It is this fact that stands definitely in the way of substantial success of the administration program so far as it applies to the resurrection of our foreign markets.

Mr. THURSTON. May I say also that most of the European nations have requirements that 80 percent of the wheat milled within their borders must be domestic wheat?

Mr. WOODRUFF. I know that various European countries are paying large bounties to the growers of agricultural products in order that they may become entirely self-sustaining. This is true of France. I think the wheat grower of France is paid a bounty of more than \$1 per bushel by the Government, while the American farmer apparently cannot by any means secure for his wheat the cost of producing it.

Mr. TRUAX. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUFF. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio for a question but not for a speech.

Mr. TRUAX. May I say to the gentleman that in 1932 the average price of wheat in Paris was \$1.71, and I think it is about the same price now.

Mr. WOODRUFF. This is brought about by the fact that the Government paid a large bounty to the growers of wheat. May I say something about the cost of production of wheat in France? In 1917, just before I left France to come back to this country for demobilization, I secured a leave of absence and made a trip through the Pyrenees country, which is the great wheat-growing section of France. This was in July. Every valley in those beautiful mountains was a string of golden grain. They do not have the large farms over there that we have here. If a farmer has 10 acres of soil which he can cultivate, he is considered to be a very well-to-do farmer. On almost every one of these little plots of land the people were harvesting the wheat, and what do you suppose was the agricultural implement they were using? There were men and women, old and also those in the full bloom of health, as well as little children, gathering this wheat and every one of them had a sickle in his hand. This is the agricultural implement they were using to gather the grain. The cost of production is high over there. It is higher, of course, than it is here because of the labor-displacing machinery that we use for that purpose on the farms in this country.

Mr. GIFFORD. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. WOODRUFF. I will be pleased to yield.

Mr. GIFFORD. I am extremely interested to know, after listening to promises over the radio as well as other promises that have been made for months, whether the devaluation of the gold dollar has brought about a condition whereby the farmer now has to bring in 40 percent less wheat to pay his debts.

Mr. WOODRUFF. I think not, I will say to my friend from Massachusetts; but I know the gentleman will pardon me if I do not go into that, as I have much I wish yet to say about the question I am discussing.

Mr. Chairman, with the exception of a very few commodities which we now produce by use of mass-production machinery cheaper than they can be produced in foreign countries, foreign costs are all much lower than ours. Even our mass production is becoming the common thing throughout the world. We are, as rapidly as possible, supplying our foreign competitors with these machines. How long do you suppose we can continue to do this and at the same time continue to supply these foreign countries with the products of these machines?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SINCLAIR. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 10 additional minutes.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Now, may I ask the Membership to please let me proceed without interruption from now on. I have much I wish to say. If I find I have time later, I will be pleased to yield to any Member, but for a few minutes at least please let me proceed.

Let us see who want the American sugar industry protected and fostered and who want it destroyed. During the hearings in 1930 on the tariff bill there appeared before the Senate Finance Committee the following organizations urging that this great American industry be preserved: The National Grange, American Farm Bureau Federation, Northwest Agricultural Foundation, Mountain States Beet Growers' Marketing Association, Northwestern Ohio and Southern Michigan Sugar Beet Growers' Association, Indiana Sugar Beet Growers' Association, Michigan State Farm Bureau, South Dakota Beet Growers, Utah State Farm Bureau, Commissioner of Agriculture of Wyoming, Progressive Pomona Grange, No. 4, of Colorado, Crowley County (Colo.) Farmers' Institute, Western Colorado Beet Growers' Association, Weld County (Colo.) Farmers' Institute, Servier County (Utah) Farm Bureau, Racine-Kenosha (Wis.) Counties Beet Growers' Association, Michigan State Department of Agriculture, and the Idaho Beet Growers' Association.

In addition to these appearances before the committees the following important farm organizations filed with Senators a statement advocating an increase in the sugar tariff: National Cooperative Milk Producers' Association, National Dairy Union, American Livestock Association, National Wool Marketing Council, Vegetable Growers' Association of America, Kansas State Livestock Association, National Livestock Producers' Association. Hundreds of briefs and statements have also been filed with the Senate committee urging the proposed increase from chambers of commerce throughout the South and West. Among the appearances before the committee may also be cited the Domestic Sugar Producers' Association, the United States Beet Sugar Association, the American Sugar Cane League, Hawaiian Sugar Planters Association, and the Association of Sugar Producers of Puerto Rico.

These were a few of the proponents. In addition to these organizations other important farm organizations advocated an increase in the sugar tariff.

And now, Mr. Chairman, let us see some of those who opposed protection for this American industry and advocated its destruction. Prominent among those was the United States Sugar Association, representing Americans who, with their money, controlled the Cuban sugar industry; the American bottlers of carbonated beverages; the American Exporters and Importers Association; the Hershey Chocolate interests who have sugar plantations and refineries in Cuba. I cannot refrain from noting, Mr. Chairman, that it was this company that reduced the size of its chocolate bars that the little children spent their nickles for during the war, and when sugar declined from the high war prices to 4 and 5 cents a pound they never increased the size of that bar, and so far as I know they have not reduced the price of that bar, but continue to levy their tribute from the pennies of America's children.

These same interests reached into the pockets of the public through the soda "pop" business and took their tribute too. Who was another prominent autocrat of the sugar industry—the National City Bank of New York, and when we say the National City Bank of that day, we say Charles Mitchell. When we say the National City Bank of that day,

we say Gordon Rentschler, and we think of his brother, B. F. Rentschler; and the public has not forgotten the story of how the Rentschlers ran an investment of \$250 to \$35,000,000, as exposed in the aircraft scandals by the Black investigating committee of the Senate; nor have we forgotten the methods by which Mr. Charles Mitchell escaped paying a most substantial income tax by temporarily transferring to his wife certain stocks while they were far below the price he had paid, thereby claiming losses which he could charge against his income. And we have not forgotten either, how very promptly after the income tax was paid that this same stock, without the transaction ever having been registered on the books of the company, was again transferred from wife to husband who took advantage of this situation to evade the tax he should have paid.

Let me at this point quote from a speech made on the 10th of January 1930 in the United States Senate, in which the open charge was made by Senator Reed Smoot, of Utah, that the American-Cuban sugar interests led by the National City Bank, of New York, attempted to sabotage and to bankrupt the entire American domestic sugar industry.

O Mr. President, if I could only tell the whole story of the intrigues and the rotten deals connected with this matter it would surprise the Senate. I would refer to the fact that a decision was reached at one time to destroy the sugar industry in the United States. I know the story. Is it any wonder that in the hearings I had little patience with some of the statements which were made.

The above citations demonstrate that the sugar tariff is an agricultural tariff and that an increased duty is advocated by all important farm organizations as an essential part of any farm-relief plan. This attitude is but natural, for the farmer is a partner in the beet-sugar business. Under the participating contract between the factories and the farmers they are paid for their beets according to the net price received for the extracted sugar, the division being generally on a 50-50 basis. In addition, the contract fixes a guaranteed minimum price per ton of beets. With no other farm crop does the farmer enjoy such privilege.

The farm organizations are also of the belief, and rightly so, that with adequate protection the domestic beet-sugar industry could be extensively expanded, and that hundreds of thousands of acres now devoted to grain crops could be devoted to sugar production with profit to sugar-beet farmers, and at the same time decrease the volume of surplus crops which now prove so troublesome.

Let us now consider briefly the motives actuating those opposing the proposed rates. I have referred to the National City Bank, so perhaps I had better refer first to their activities.

TARIFF PROPAGANDA ACTIVITIES OF THE NATIONAL CITY BANK

The National City Bank of New York has been broadcasting statements to banks throughout the country not only opposing an increase in the duty on sugar but many of them indirectly inimical to the credit of domestic beet-sugar companies. I ask Senators to read the hearings. The National City Bank went so far as to intimate that the domestic beet-sugar companies could not borrow any more money, and warned their stockholders that the industry would be a failure. Having acquired large sugar holdings in Cuba, that bank would like to see the domestic sugar industry destroyed so that larger profits from its foreign investments might accrue.

During the skyrocketing of prices in 1920 the National City Bank, believing that large profits were to be made in loaning money to Cuban sugar mills, poured some hundred million or so dollars into that industry.

The result of this inflation is well known to everyone. Due to the cupidity of the Cubans and Americans with money invested in the Cuban industry, sugar gradually seeped into this country from all over the world, and at the end of 1920 the price of Cuban raws had dropped from 23½ cents a pound to approximately 1¼ cents. It was then, Mr. President, that the National City Bank thought that the wise thing to do was to take the Cuban sugar, throw it upon the market, kill the local industry, and then reap a thousand percent reward when the sugar industry of this country was destroyed. Thank God, they were not successful in that effort, but it was due to no fault of theirs.

Due to this sudden deflation it is alleged that the National City Bank was left with something like a hundred million dollars of securities which were practically worthless. In other words, the officials of that bank, through lack of judgment, had squandered millions of dollars gambling that the outrageous levels would be continued permanently. Nine years ago, I repeat, the National City lent its name and its resources to a program which was designed to continue abnormal sugar prices.

Mr. President, it is greatly to the advantage of the National City that we vote no adequate protection for sugar, and in the same degree it is detrimental to the producers of domestic sugar. I submit that the final choice lies between the injudicious investments of the National City Bank of Wall Street and the conservative investments of American farmers in American agriculture. We must not be misled by the false arguments ad-

vanced by an institution which a few short years ago attempted to levy tribute on the American people by taking advantage of unduly high prices. We cannot consider seriously the propaganda that such an institution has completely changed face and is now the savior of the American people.

Notwithstanding the great deflation in Cuban sugar prices, the general impression prevailed in the sugar trade in 1920 that after the deflation period had passed and conditions became normal large profits would have been earned on money invested in that industry. This idea was rightly predicated on the fact that sugar can be produced cheaper in Cuba than any other country. After the crash came in 1921 many Cuban mills were deeply in debt financially to the National City Bank. That institution promptly set about squeezing the Cubans and taking control of their properties. Look at the record, Senators. See how humane they were and how much interest they had in building up this great industry. At the present time the officials of that bank are broadcasting propaganda against an increase in our sugar tariff because they allege it will be harmful to the poor Cubans. I want to say now to the good people here that if we in this country lived as extravagantly as some of the Cuban people are living, there would be quite a change in the minds of the American people and there would be a reformation. But the insincerity of the interest of the bank officials in the Cuban people is obvious, when we remember that they had no hesitancy in putting the thumbscrews upon them when the opportunity was presented.

Having exacted its pound of flesh from the poor Cubans, this bank took over the better organized mills of its creditors and formed a holding company known as "General Sugars, Inc.", under which it is now operating these mills.

I now call attention to the fact that at last accounts, as late as 1931, the president of the General Sugars was none other than Edward A. Deeds, the gentleman whom the now Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court following his investigation into the aircraft fiasco and scandals of the war, recommended be court-martialed; the same gentleman who is among those who dominated the air-mail companies whose subsidy contracts have just been canceled; the same gentleman who is interested in the aircraft manufacturing interests which are now under examination by committees of the House for wringing extortionate profits from the Army and Navy air services. The same Mr. Deeds whose son testified before the Black Committee that he turned \$40 worth of aircraft stock into something like \$5,000,000. This is one of the gentlemen who will be greatly benefited by this program if it is carried out.

I am constrained, Mr. Chairman, at this point, to voice a query which has been in my mind for some time. Cuba has just passed through a stormy revolution following years of effort to depose the dictator, former President Machado. From time to time sinister hints have been voiced in the press that certain American interests were concerned in keeping Mr. Machado in the Presidency over the protests of his people. These items in the press have indicated a bitterness on the part of the Cuban people toward the United States that narrowly escaped forcing American intervention. It would be very interesting, Mr. Chairman, if an investigation were made to learn how much the American-Cuban sugar interests had to do with this situation in Cuba, which is not yet healed.

I have not the time, Mr. Chairman, to go into the details of the Caraway lobby investigation in 1930, except to remind the Members of this body that the press at that time was filled with glaring headlines of the attempts made by Mr. Lakin and others, of the various demands which had been made by the Cuban-American sugar interests to destroy the American domestic sugar industry, even to the extent of furnishing funds to foreign agents to attack such industry.

Why, Mr. Chairman, this whole record is replete and slimy with the machinations of a group of Americans blinded by greed, ready to not alone prey upon their own countrymen, not alone ready to destroy a great American industry, and to send into the breadlines more thousands who now are engaged in the production of domestic sugar, but they have demonstrated that they would even go to the lengths of rendering this country dependent upon a foreign source for one of its most important food necessities.

I want now to deal as briefly as possible with some of the considerations which apparently have moved the President in this matter. He, in his message of February 8 of this year, stated to the Congress that, "Steadily increasing sugar production in the continental United States and in insular

regions has created a price and marketing situation prejudicial to virtually everyone interested. Farmers in many areas are threatened with low prices for their beets and cane, and Cuban purchases of our goods have dwindled steadily as her shipments of sugar to this country have declined.

There is a school of thought which believes that sugar ought to be on the free list. This belief is based on the high cost of sugar to the American consuming public.

I find myself unable to follow a line of reasoning which argues that an expanding production of sugar in the United States is causing an increase in the price to the consumer while, at the same time, it is causing a decrease in the returns to the domestic cane and beet growers. I do not see the logic of an argument that to reduce the price of sugar to the consumer will result in an increase in the returns to the domestic beet and cane grower. I cannot follow the process of reasoning by which it is argued that an expanding sugar production can be harmful to either the consumer or the domestic producer, in view of the fact that the domestic sugar production is less than one third of our domestic consumption demands.

It seems to me that here is the one agricultural activity which can be expanded to the great advantage of the American farmer, American labor, American invested capital, and the American sugar consumer.

I can understand an argument that it is economically unsound to further expand a volume of production which now exceeds our domestic consumption demands, but I have always understood that high prices to the consumer result not from overproduction but from underproduction, and the low prices to the producer result not from underproduction but from overproduction.

It may be argued that, due to control of distribution by selfish agencies, it would be possible for the sugar industry in this country to be expanded, while at the same time the beet and cane growers would reap a less return on their efforts. Conceivably this is so. But, Mr. Chairman, we have for months been reading in the press of the new economic control by the administration, which the administration asserts gives it not only control of both production and distributing agencies, but we have been assured thousands of times in the press that the Government has ample power, and is exercising that power, to protect the consuming public against extortion and profiteering and also to protect the agricultural producer against oppression by selfish agencies.

If these assurances are not true, then the keystone of the whole structure of our new economic set-up is missing and that structure is but a figment of the imagination. If these assertions are true, by what process of reasoning can we assume that, with every other industrial activity in the United States under the control of the Government and the President, a control which assures the consumer and the raw-material producer full justice, this control would not be extended to include the various factors in the production and distribution of sugar in the United States.

It must be perfectly obvious that Mr. Roosevelt is not familiar with sugar prices throughout the world, or he would have known that of all the important countries in the world American consumers are paying less for their sugar than any other. He would know also that the American people have paid as little for their sugar during the past two years as at any time in our history. The President apparently assumes that if this product were to be put upon the free list that automatically the price to the American consumer would be substantially reduced. In judging the future action of an individual we find it wise always to scan his past actions. If he has followed certain lines of conduct under certain conditions, it is reasonable to suppose he will follow the same lines under the same conditions in the future.

In recent years there has been just one outstanding period during which there was no American domestic competition for Cuban-American sugar. It so happens that at this particular period there was no American domestic sugar

on the market, as I have previously stated. The situation, so far as control of the market is concerned, was identical with that which will exist if some of our self-interested Wall Street citizens can have their way. Were the consumers given any consideration at that time? The housewives of the Nation who found it necessary to pay as high as 32 cents per pound for their sugar know they were not.

It must be that the administration has completely forgotten that sugar debauch of 1920, which a few moments ago I described in some detail. It is this that convinces me the President is being ill-advised and misled in this proposed program having to do with sugar. It is true that further along the President in his message says, "I do not at this time"—I call attention to these words, "at this time"—"recommend placing sugar on the free list." He then declares for a—

System of quotas with the threefold object of keeping down the price of sugar to consumers, of providing for the retention of beet and cane farming within our continental limits, and also to provide against further expansion of this necessarily expensive industry.

Which means "against further expansion" of the one crop, which not only is a certain crop for the American farmers but also a profitable one; which means to provide against expansion of one crop which the farm can raise under a guaranteed minimum price, and which guarantees the American consumer against exploitation at the hands of foreign producers; which means further unemployment of farm laborers, sugar-factory workers, refinery employees, executives, technicians, railroad employees, and less National, State, and local taxes.

It seems incomprehensible that anyone could desire to prevent an extension of these advantages in an industry which admittedly never has at its best produced more than 33 percent of our domestic needs of a necessary food commodity. Why, Mr. Chairman, what reason is there under God's heaven why American farmers, American farm laborers, American mill laborers, American executives should not create an industry capable of providing much more of our domestic needs, an industry which would pay taxes here, and which could be kept always within reasonable bounds by a tariff only high enough to give the farmer a more profitable price for their beets and cane and give the domestic industry the first call on the American market. Experience has shown us that we can in this way keep the price of sugar to the consumer at a reasonable level, while at the same time give the American citizens the opportunity to which they are entitled.

Am I too severe when I say that the adoption of this program presented by the administration would result in the destruction of the American beet-sugar industry? Under this program, to whom would the control of the administration of this great industry be given? To Secretary Wallace, Professor Tugwell, and Mr. Weaver, whose views have already been quoted? What does the present Secretary of the Department of Agriculture believe about the domestic sugar industry? He believes, according to a United Press dispatch recently published, that it is a hothouse industry and that cane and beet growing should never have been started in the United States; and the fact that it did start was the result of ill-advised Republican encouragement. It is further stated in the same dispatch that the 2 cents per pound tariff has cost the American consumer many times what the domestic industry is worth. Can anyone doubt what will happen if the future of this industry is to repose in the hands of men holding the views of the gentlemen I have named?

Now, there is another point which is argued, and that is that we have given American capital invested in Cuban sugar production protection under the 20-percent tariff preferential. Let us see what the Cuban sugar producers have done with that 20-percent preferential. In a statement in the Washington Herald of February 18, 1934, the Honorable John Bass shows conclusively that the Cuban sugar producers are not selling their sugars on the basis of cost of production plus a reasonable profit, but are selling the sugars in the United States markets in competition with Puerto Rican

sugars away below the cost of production; and if Cuba had been selling and were selling today its sugars in the United States markets at the cost of production plus a reasonable profit, and furthermore would get the preferential to which it is entitled under the tariff law, the present sugar duty would be adequate. But since that is not the case and has not been the case during the last few years, the fact is the present duty is inadequate. According to Mr. Bass, Cuban sugars were sold to the United States during 1931 under the world market price during the months of that year: February, 4 points; March, 8 points; April, 11 points; May, 17 points; and June, 13 points. If this statement be true, how does it come that the Cuban sugar industry is suffering so, and yet apparently does not want to take advantage either of a reasonable price or of its 20-percent preferential unless it is for the purpose on the part of Americans who control that industry to destroy the American domestic sugar industry entirely?

[Here the gavel fell.]

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

Mr. WOODRUFF. There is now another point which it cited; namely, that since imports of Cuban sugar have fallen off, Cuba has ceased buying many things from the United States, including agricultural products. The President touches on this in his message of February 8 when he says, "Cuban purchases of our goods have dwindled steadily as her shipments of sugar to this country have declined", and apparently believes we have only to resume buying Cuban sugar to revive the market we once had among her people.

Mr. Chairman, let us see about that. Let me call attention to Trade Information Bulletin No. 725, issued by the United States Department of Commerce in 1930, and also to the report of Mr. Charles F. Knox, Jr., Division of Regional Information, which appeared in the Commerce Reports issued by the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, United States Department of Commerce, June 27, 1932, as quoted by Mr. Bass, reading, in part, as follows:

In 1924 Cuba's main industry—the growth and manufacture of sugar—began to feel the stagnating effects of world overproduction of that commodity. The price of sugar began to decline, slowly but persistently, despite strenuous efforts to curtail production and restrict exports, and the industry, whose ramifications extend like a vast network over the entire island, was forced to contract its activities. Since 1924 this contraction has been reflected in almost every phase of Cuban economic activity. To offset the diminished activity, the Government began a strenuous campaign for agricultural diversification and industrial stimulation * * *. Meat, milk, potatoes, corn, coffee, vegetables, and other edibles flooded into the city markets and the money obtained from the sale of these commodities began to filter out from the cities to the country districts, instead of being transmitted abroad to pay for imported foodstuffs.

Encouraged by high-tariff protection (the high Cuban tariff) capital for production to supply the domestic market began flowing into Cuba. American manufacturers, who now found it difficult to sell to Cuba because of the (Cuban) protective tariffs, investigated the possibilities of establishing branch factories on the island, and in not a few cases carried out the idea. Factories were built to process raw foodstuffs into manufactured edibles, similar if not identical to the products formerly imported. Large investments were made in the milk industry, the cheese and butter industries, lard, meat products, poultry, vegetable oils, and others. Nor did Cuban and foreign capital stop with foodstuffs. Factories were erected to produce hosiery, textiles, paints, garments, cement, furniture, and a great miscellany of other articles. This new Cuban movement has drastically reduced certain of our exports to Cuba—exports which were formerly thought to be indispensable to the Cubans, in that they were necessities of life not produced in the island.

This decrease of \$33,732,000 in the value of certain exports is not to be accounted for by the Cuban depression, although undoubtedly some part of it may be attributed to that cause. These articles of export were necessities, and they still are so far as the Cubans are concerned. If the Cubans are not importing them, it does not necessarily mean that they are going without them. They are getting the greater part of them from another source, and that source is from the newly established Cuban industries which are now supplying similar or identical products. Therefore, it is apparent that the trade decline in those commodities listed in the above table is not a temporary trade dislocation. Rather it appears to be a definite disappearance of the market for those items as far as the American exporter is concerned.

The question might well be asked, What effect will these new developments have on our future exports to Cuba when the Cuban economic conditions improve? To answer this question one must return again to the question of food supply. If the Cuban can

produce the greater part of their own food supply and thus save a heavy foreign bill for imported foodstuffs, they are, from the Cuban standpoint, considerably better off. In the future, when the economic situation improves and their cash income returns to a more normal basis, the Cubans may not be inclined to spend from 75 to 80 percent of that cash income on imported staple foodstuffs. They have become familiar now with their own manufactured products.

What becomes of the argument that we must reduce and eventually destroy the American beet-sugar industry in order to preserve to the American farmer and the American industrialists their export market in Cuba in the face of this report as late as 1932 from the Department of Commerce? Of course, this thing which has happened in Cuba, as set forth in this quoted excerpt from this report, is identically the thing that has happened to every country in the world. American engineers, American machinery have enabled these other countries, including Cuba, to manufacture their own necessities, and that is peculiarly true of Cuba, and yet we are invited here to hamstring and strangle a great American industry, producing an essential food product, in order that we may rehabilitate Cuba and the American-financed Cuban sugar industry.

Even if this were true, just why, I ask, should the American beet farmer and the American cane grower and the American mill workers and American sugar refiners be asked to assume this burden of rehabilitating the Cuban market for other American exports? But the fact is, that is not true. The interests which will be rehabilitated, if this proposal to strangle the American beet-sugar industry is put into effect, are the American Cuban interests. The interests which will receive the benefit are this small group of rapacious American financiers who still control the Cuban sugar industry, who wrung those extortionate profits running into the tens of millions of dollars from the pockets of the American consumers in 1920.

Let no man for one moment believe that we are going to rehabilitate the Cuban market for other American exports by killing the American domestic sugar industry and placing ourselves at the mercy of these proven exploiters. Let no man believe for one moment, Mr. Chairman, that we are going to benefit the American beet farmer or the American cane farmer or the American laboring man or the American sugar consumer by turning over the control of the American sugar market, through control of production, to any such group of unconscionable profiteers as this group has proven itself to be.

It may be argued that since our domestic growers produced in 1933 about one third of our sugar supply, our insular possessions about one third, and Cuba exported to us about one third, that we can surrender our domestic production and still control the Cuban prices through the production of our insular possessions.

We must keep in mind that the Philippines will sooner or later be granted their independence, whereupon they undoubtedly will be placed in a similar position to that of Cuba, so far as tariffs on imports into this country are concerned; that Puerto Rico has severe hurricanes which frequently reduce its production of sugar; that Hawaii has about reached her peak of sugar production; and, most importantly, Mr. Chairman, we must keep in mind that the eventual repeal of the tariff will operate, not only to destroy our continental production but will operate to destroy the Puerto Rican production and the Hawaiian production, because it is an established fact that production costs are higher in these two Territories than they are in Cuba.

Who believes for a moment that the powerful group which has been fighting for years to destroy the American sugar industry, if they succeed in that, would not immediately set out to destroy both the Puerto Rican and Hawaiian sugar industries as well? It also is impossible for the Philippine producers to compete with the Cubans. It is only one step further to bring about either the destruction of the industry in the Philippine Islands or at least keep the Philippine sugar from the American market.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I cannot escape the sinister import of the statement made by the Secretary of Agricul-

ture, Mr. Wallace, in his recent article, in which he said, in speaking of the economic readjustment which appealed to him:

The Government might have to help furnish means for the orderly retirement of such businesses, and even select those which are thus to be retired.

It seems to me that these words should arrest the attention of every citizen, every business man, every industry in this country, because who is going to decide, if this program goes through based upon any such philosophy as that? Who, I ask, is going to decide what businesses shall be destroyed, what businesses shall be permitted to live, what citizens shall be condemned to have their businesses destroyed, and what citizens shall be favored by permitting their businesses to live? What agency will control, what individual will be the all-powerful arbiter executioner, and what motives finally might actuate such an individual?

Why, Mr. Chairman, when I consider these points in the light of the situation and in the light of the whole philosophy of a free democratic government, I stand appalled at the future possibilities if we do this thing. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert the following information:

Because the United States is usually alluded to as a highly protected country, an erroneous impression prevails among many people that the rates of duty on sugar are above the rates prevailing in other countries. A glance at the following table demonstrates to the contrary:

Import duty on 96° raw sugar or equivalent at exchange rates on Sept. 1, 1928

	Cents per pound
Brazil.....	17.610
Salvador.....	15.876
Peru.....	9.428
Greece.....	5.723
Belgium.....	5.047
Guatemala.....	4.902
Spain.....	4.822
Poland.....	4.572
Czechoslovakia.....	4.538
Turkey.....	4.478
Costa Rica.....	3.773
Norway.....	3.703
Honduras.....	3.587
Rumania.....	2.914
Finland.....	2.892
Uruguay.....	2.722
Paraguay.....	2.608
Argentina.....	2.462
Russia.....	2.330
Germany.....	2.270
Irish Free State.....	2.270
Venezuela.....	2.189
Australia.....	2.022
Newfoundland.....	2.000
Bulgaria.....	1.962
Hungary.....	1.816
United Kingdom (plus bounty) ¹	1.811
Canada.....	1.770
United States (Cuban rate).....	1.7648

Import duty on 100° refined sugar or equivalent at exchange rates on Sept. 1, 1928

	Cents per pound
Brazil.....	17.610
Salvador.....	15.876
Guatemala.....	9.803
Peru.....	9.428
Turkey.....	7.562
Costa Rica.....	7.074
Venezuela.....	6.566
Greece.....	5.723
Poland.....	5.080
Belgium.....	5.047
Spain.....	4.822
Czechoslovakia.....	4.538
Newfoundland.....	4.500
Rumania.....	4.432
Russia.....	4.194
Norway.....	3.703
Honduras.....	3.587
Argentina.....	3.427
Paraguay.....	3.260
Dominica.....	3.219
Finland.....	3.204
Australia.....	3.016
Uruguay.....	2.786
Germany.....	2.700
Yugoslavia.....	2.633
Colombia.....	2.592

For footnote 1 see bottom of next column.

Import duty on 100° refined sugar or equivalent at exchange rates on Sept. 1, 1928—Continued

	Cents per pound
Irish Free State.....	2.535
United Kingdom (plus bounty) ¹	2.527
Bulgaria.....	2.403
Italy.....	2.167
Austria.....	2.002
United States (Cuban rate).....	1.912

Mr. Chairman, I also insert the following testimony of Mr. A. J. S. Weaver, referred to earlier:

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Weaver, I think I can see what the immediate effect of this plan may be, but I am more concerned as to what may be the permanent policy to be developed when this plan is put into effect.

Now, if I understand your position correctly, it is that sugar production in this country is inefficient; that it requires an amount of tariff protection which results in an increased cost to the consumer and that, therefore, it is undesirable, at least to permit it to expand; and yet you come in now with a plan which, in itself, does not contemplate any reduction in the costs of the product to the consumer, but which at the same time would not permit the domestic industry to expand.

Now, are not these two positions inconsistent, if it is an inefficient industry, one which we are not to protect through a tariff and one which is causing the American consumer to pay a higher price than he would otherwise pay should we not stop protecting it altogether? On the other hand, if it is inconsistent to do that, what justification is there for keeping the domestic price up to the level that it has been in the past?

Mr. WEAVER. I should say that the suggestion in the President's message had an important bearing on that question. The President said, as I remember, that he did not now favor putting sugar on the free list; and, as I read the message, it seemed to me that the implication was that that would be a tremendous shock to an important industry.

He suggested that we call a halt, consolidate our position with respect to domestic production, which might ultimately result in concentration of sugar production in the most productive land, which may simply provide as a basis for an immediate halt, and the President may contemplate taking further steps in reducing the production of sugar in the United States. I do not know. That is, however, a fair impression, I think, of the President's message; but it is important not to cause such a tremendous shock on such an important population as putting sugar on the free list might.

Mr. HOPE. Then, in other words, the whole purpose of this measure is to gradually eliminate the domestic-sugar production; is that it?

Mr. WEAVER. Of course, it could be done drastically and at the cost of a great shock to the sugar-producing population.

Mr. HOPE. Then, are we safe, or justified, rather, in assuming that it is the policy of the administration to ultimately eliminate the domestic producer and American production?

Mr. WEAVER. Of course, the legislation now being considered is, as has been suggested before, emergency legislation, and therefore there are other considerations. There are purely emergency considerations. For example, with the large beet crop produced this year in conjunction with the large crops in most of the other areas supplying the United States market, there have been disorganized markets for sugar which have benefited distributors in most cases rather than consumers, and which have been at the cost of the producers of beets and continental cane.

Beet factories have been forced, in order to sell their products, to absorb a much greater amount of freight than is customary for them to do. Sugar has moved, beet sugar is moving, into New England, I understand, and that means, in many cases, there is a crosshaul of sugar from the eastern refining points to the Rocky Mountain region, and there is no guaranty that would not go further and bring us back to last year's very low world prices, of which and about which the beet producers and continental cane producers complained, and rightfully complained.

Mr. HOPE. It is not the purpose of the administration through this plan, or any other plan, to reduce the cost of beet sugar to the consumer?

Mr. WEAVER. No. No; at least not under the situation that I spoke of just now. That is entirely different from any long-time program of which you speak, and I do not think that you can say so; that I do not think it is the point of view of the administration, that they want sugar at such low prices as to result in or results from disorganized markets. On the other hand, I think it is true that a great deal of the results from the disorganized market of sugar has not gone to the consumer. Of course, some of it has gone to the railroads. Much of it has gone to distributors. Some of it has gone to speculators and others. It has not gone to the consumer.

Mr. HOPE. If it is not the purpose of the administration to reduce the price of sugar to the consumer, what objection is there then to permitting an expansion of the domestic industry in this country?

Mr. WEAVER. I do not follow that question.

¹In addition to the import duty on sugar Great Britain grants a bounty on sugar and molasses manufactured from beets grown in that country. The above rates are exclusive of excise, sales, and other internal taxes which are also applied to domestic sugar, these extra taxes being applied in many countries.

Mr. HOPE. Well, I will repeat the question. If there is no desire on the part of the administration to reduce the price of sugar to the consumer, what reason is there for restricting domestic production?

Mr. WEAVER. There, of course, is a desire; a desire on the part of the administration to reduce costs of living and to reduce the excessive costs of sugar to the population of the United States.

In this emergency situation it is not possible to do everything at once; but, now speaking from the point of view of long-time policy now, if further expansion is continued, the United States will be saddled, possibly forever, with a high-cost industry which is not a fair thing to contemplate for consumers.

Mr. HOPE. Well, then, in other words, the policy is to start in eliminating the industry before it gets any bigger. Am I correct in that assumption?

Mr. WEAVER. Yes; I think that is a reasonable statement.

Mr. Chairman, I also insert the statement of the American Farm Bureau Federation by Chester H. Gray in regard to H.R. 7907.

Since this measure, H.R. 7907, is in substance a repetition of the proposed marketing agreement on sugar, which was under consideration for months during 1933, and was finally disapproved by Secretary Wallace, the American Farm Bureau Federation can do nothing else in regard to the pending measure than to oppose it, as was done in regard to the proposed marketing agreement of 1933.

The main reasons which led to this position are:

1. The proposed measure is an amendment to the Agricultural Adjustment Act. That act, in sections 1 and 2, declare unequivocally that the intent and purpose of the act is to benefit one individual, namely the American farmer, by bringing to him parity prices for agricultural products. The proposed measure, equally with the former proposed sugar-marketing agreement, instead of benefiting the American farmer would bring prior benefits to the off-shore and importing interests instead.

2. Since this proposed measure is an amendment to the Agricultural Adjustment Act, it, if enacted in any form, should confine its provisions to the domestic interests of the American farmer rather than extending its provisions far beyond the original intent of the Agricultural Adjustment Act by becoming international in character. It is meant to state that the Agricultural Adjustment Act by amendment should not be made to become an instrument by which investments, American and otherwise, in Puerto Rico, Cuba, and the Philippines should be placed on a higher point of vantage than is the American farmer.

3. The domestic production of sugar is approximately one fourth our domestic consumption; consequently any effort at this time to decrease production of this very essential farm product is neither economically necessary nor in the spirit of the Agricultural Adjustment Act. That act, in addition to its declaration of policy in sections 1 and 2, which substantially promises parity prices for agricultural products, states in section 3 (1), "in order to effectuate the declared policy, the Secretary of Agriculture shall have power * * * to provide for rental or benefit payments * * * upon that part of the production of any basic agricultural commodity required for domestic consumption." Since every ton of the domestic production of sugar, whether from cane or beets, is required for domestic consumption, it is logical to assume that all benefits of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, such as rental or benefit payments, are not dependent upon reduction in production but might logically be applied to this commodity, sugar, until its quantity came to be so large that a portion thereof—that is, a surplus—would not be required for domestic consumption.

4. The statement made by some that sugar is not an economic crop, which has been explained to mean that it can be produced abroad more cheaply than in the United States is no justification for provisions in H.R. 7907, which allow entry into our markets of too great quantities of foreign sugar. Unless we are willing to classify as "uneconomic", many other crops which can be produced abroad more cheaply than in the United States we have no foundation for so classifying sugar. To adopt this sort of argument would place the following crops in the position of being uneconomic, with the natural conclusion—following the erroneous argument of spokesmen for foreign sugar interests—that our American farmers who produce them should not long enjoy the home market.

(a) Milk, in a recent year, had a United States cost in northern New York and northern Vermont of 25.5 cents per gallon; milk for the same year just across the line in Canada had a cost of 21.1 cents per gallon.

(b) Cream in a recent year delivered to the New York market had a cost of \$2.60 per gallon; cream for the same year delivered to the same market from Canada had a cost of \$2.27 per gallon.

(c) Butter delivered to the New York market from the United States had a cost of 56.06 cents per pound; butter from Denmark, delivered to the New York market for the same year had a cost of 41.11 cents per pound.

(d) Beef cattle in a recent year in Wyoming cost \$9.65 per hundred pounds; from Argentina the cost of beef cattle was \$5.33 per hundred pounds delivered to our markets.

(e) Corn in 1926-27 had a United States cost of \$1.23; Argentine corn was delivered at San Francisco in the same period at 93.6 cents per bushel.

(f) In 1930 dried beans in the United States cost 6.5 cents per pound; from Japan the cost was 3.9 cents per pound delivered to Philadelphia in both cases.

(g) Fresh Lima beans in 1930 in the United States cost 11.1 cents per pound; from Cuba, 7.8 cents per pound.

(h) Onions delivered to New York in 1926 cost in the United States \$3.39 per hundred pounds; from Spain, \$2.18 per hundred pounds.

(i) Fresh tomatoes in 1930 delivered to New York had a United States cost of 8 cents per pound; from Mexico, 5.9 cents per pound.

(j) Canned tomatoes, in a public hearing before the Tariff Commission, were shown to have a cost of \$1.36 per dozen cans; from Italy, \$1.07 per dozen cans.

(k) Maple sirup, according to data presented to the Tariff Commission, cost in the United States 16.47 cents per pound; from Canada, 12.92 cents per pound.

(l) Maple sugar from the United States cost 26.20 cents per pound; from Canada, 20.88 cents per pound.

(m) Cherries, sulphured or in brine, in 1926 delivered to New York had a United States cost of 22.8 cents per pound; from Italy, 12.9 cents per pound.

(n) Lemons, delivered to New York, had a United States cost in 1930 of \$4.13 per box; from Sicily, \$2.33 per box.

(o) Almonds in 1928 cost in the United States 53.2 cents per pound; the average value of imported almonds was 39 cents per pound.

(p) Flaxseed delivered to New York in 1931 cost \$2.54 per bushel; from the Argentine, \$1.98 per bushel.

(q) Fresh green peas, delivered to New York, in 1930 cost in the United States 13.7 cents per pound; from Mexico, 9.7 cents per pound.

(r) Peppers delivered to New York in 1930 cost in the United States 7.2 cents per pound; from Cuba, 4.7 cents per pound; from Mexico, 6.8 cents per pound.

(s) Wool delivered to Boston in 1930 cost in the United States \$1.10 per pound; from Argentina, 56.6 cents per pound; from Australia, 68.2 cents per pound.

If sugar is an uneconomic crop, and as a consequence, according to some observers, we must turn our home markets over to the foreigner and to the foreign product, then we must likewise be consistent and surrender our domestic markets on many a crop, some of which have been enumerated above. The disparity between the cost of producing sugar under American and foreign conditions is no greater, and in many instances lesser, than is the disparity between the American and the foreign costs of production on other farm crops.

5. Another peculiar slant has been taken by some witnesses in regard to H.R. 7907, both by those who spoke for the administration and those who testified for importing interests. It has been said by these witnesses that since sugar is now deficient in supplying the home market, the home market should be surrendered to foreign producers; the thought seemingly being that no effort should be put forth to expand production within the continental United States. If this sort of argument should be allowed to apply in the case of sugar, it will also apply in the following crops, in each and every instance there being annual or seasonal deficiencies in domestic production:

Flaxseed; buckwheat; fresh winter vegetables, such as tomatoes, snap beans, green beans, cucumbers; canned tomatoes; peas; potatoes; soybeans; almonds; cherries; grapefruit; lemons; limes; figs; dates; olives; English walnuts; filberts; peanuts; currants; beef cattle; wool; milk; cream; butter; maple sirup; maple sugar.

The two lists of commodities above given—one to show that many of our domestic farm crops cost more than foreign crops, just as sugar does; and the other to show that many of our farm crops are deficient either regularly or seasonally in supplying the home market, just as sugar is—should serve to show conclusively that sugar is not in a class by itself. Since no such legislation as is now proposed in H.R. 7907 has been submitted or even suggested for any other farm commodity, it is wholly inadvisable to enact this type of legislation for one farm commodity. The logical alternative to this unwise procedure would be to classify sugar as a basic commodity, if, in the judgment of the committee, this is wise, and then do everything possible to expand its production so that the home market will be preserved for the domestic producers rather than be surrendered to foreign producers.

6. Accordingly there should be no quota to limit the production of domestic sugar, at least until the domestic production of sugar reaches or nears the surplus point of production. There should be power given the Secretary of Agriculture to put under quota imports from the Philippines, Cuba, and Puerto Rico to supply that portion of our domestic market annually which is not supplied by domestic producers. These two provisions written as amendments to the Agricultural Adjustment Act practically are all that are needed at the present time. They would not only permit but would authorize and aid in the expansion of domestic-sugar production, and as this production increases would automatically decrease the amounts of sugar to be imported from our three most formidable competitors—the Philippines, Cuba, and Puerto Rico.

7. To accomplish these ends, if in the judgment of the committee sugar should be made a basic commodity, the entire measure, H.R. 7907, should be rewritten, so that its advantages would accrue to the domestic producers rather than to the importing sugar interests.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, all things come to him who waits. "You know too well the story of my thralldom." I am intensely interested in farming and Abraham Lincoln,

but upon this occasion I wish to defer my remarks on farming and agriculture and speak of Lincoln.

Lincoln was born in Kentucky, but as soon as he was able to get up and take a survey of his surroundings and was sufficiently developed to migrate, he left Kentucky and came to Indiana. [Laughter.] He remained in Indiana during the plastic mental period and until his character was molded that made him President in later years. Finally, on realizing that he was in competition with too many people of his own type and ability, he left Indiana and moved to Illinois where he was in a class by himself, and where the people of that State, unmindful of history and the true facts, are claiming both the glory of his birth in Kentucky and the early associations and surroundings in Indiana, which molded his character and gave him prestige, and from which he arose to the Presidency. [Laughter.]

Mr. BROWN of Kentucky. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAY. I will yield presently.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana declines to yield.

Mr. GRAY. In the meantime, Mr. Chairman, and preliminary to the remarks I will make on Lincoln, I wish to submit briefly some observations for the information of the House, and especially relating to the rights and duties of the Membership here in the conduct of proceedings under the rules and parliamentary usage governing legislative bodies.

Mr. Chairman, while I realize that rules are necessary in the conduct of proceedings of great legislative bodies, like the American Congress, yet they are often abused and the rules of this House are no exception to such experience. And while the rules are designed to give free and full expression, they are often taken advantage of to prevent such free and full expression and to stifle true reflection of public opinion. While these rules are framed to facilitate and expedite business, they are often taken advantage of here to stop or suspend business and even to cause adjournments. Like other laws, rules and regulations enacted and formulated for a good and proper use, they are often taken advantage of for a bad purpose, and until the abuses become so great and flagrant as to bring a revolt and uprising resulting in their repeal, modification, or abrogation.

But what is most significant here in the operation of these rules is the power given to small men. [Laughter.] It is constantly observed here that men of no special ability or capacity and who otherwise, without the rules, could not stop anything, can under and with the rules hold up or stop everything, can bring the House proceedings to a halt, take good men off of the floor, or even prevent good men from obtaining the floor. [Applause.] Under the rules in force here, men of miniature mental stature are given the power of a Joshua, the man who stopped the sun. Strong men are cited to remain sitting and the House commanded to stand still. [Applause.] And it is surprising to observe that when these men learn of this power by accident or otherwise, how unsparingly and lavishly they resort to it like a small boy blowing a red whistle. [Laughter.]

On February 12, Lincoln's Birthday, I asked unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes on the life and character of Abraham Lincoln, but by certain maneuvers my object was defeated. Thereafter on several consecutive days I renewed my request for unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes on the life and character of Abraham Lincoln, but the same aggregation of men, assuming the guardianship of the House, each time objected to my request. It is a significant fact, and the records will show, that this same aggregation of men not only failed to observe or recognize Lincoln's Birthday themselves, but they interposed to prevent others from rising in this House to do him honor. [Applause.]

This incident here reminds me of a similar occurrence in early life and with a like aggregation of men. I recall at this time to mind my dissertation and respects to them which I prepared in verse, the following lines of which now come to me:

But mark it well, we'll strike it rich
In fortune huge and more;
We'll pass these men while they're afoot—
We in a coach of four.

We'll then look down with that contempt
That we would pay a mole;
And nod and ask how can it be
That such can have a soul?

[Applause.]

As the men comprising this aggregation are comparative strangers to me, and without advice of their history and antecedents, it might be assumed, in mitigation of their offense, or as an apology for them, that they were new Members coming in here from the back districts [laughter], and by a very remarkable coincidence were imbued or possessed of more gall, ego, and effrontery than courtesy, knowledge, or experience, and, failing to obtain recognition on merits, took this plan to break into the Record to show some semblance of public service. [Laughter.] But I find that this hypothesis, that this explanation or apology is untenable, as I am informed that the Members of this aggregation have been here before and had gained notice in this House, or, more properly speaking, notoriety by more or less unsavory service. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, it is with great reluctance and regret that I am compelled to abandon this theory and forego this apology for them.

Mr. Chairman, I am coming more and more to conclude that this aggregation was not prompted by good-faith devotion to public duty, as assumed at this time of objections, but was actuated by some evil motive or in some petty partisan spirit, but in such wanton disregard of respect for Abraham Lincoln, parleying, trifling, temporizing with the sacred memory of the dead, and in such wise and manner as to call for challenge and resentment. [Applause.]

Of course, Mr. Chairman, I cannot say positively, I am not advised to a certainty, I am not absolutely assured, whether this indignity was directed toward myself or against Abraham Lincoln, whose name I revere among all others, and whose life and character I seek to extol. But as I have had no previous contact or dealings with this interposing aggregation of men, either individually, singly, or collectively, I can conceive of no sinister or ulterior motive actuating them against me personally. I am, therefore, constrained to conclude that this hostile spirit manifested was directed either against Abraham Lincoln personally or against the principles for which he stood and to which I will hereafter refer.

But, Mr. Chairman, in presenting this record of these unprecedented proceedings to the House for consideration and appropriate action and censure, I want it distinctly and fully understood that I am not charging or naming any Members as individuals. I am only citing for disapproval and condemnation this aggregation.

But, Mr. Chairman, what is more passing strange here is that Lincoln was elected and served as a Republican President and yet all this opposition is coming from the Republican side and all the demands to hear of Lincoln and Lincoln's policies are coming from the Democratic side, while the Cherokee strip, usually boisterous and demonstrative in keeping with the character of that country, appears quiet, neutral, and in a receptive mood. [Laughter.] This incident shows the changing times. While Lincoln was a Republican President, in 1861-65, less than 70 years ago, he would not be a Republican President today. He might be a progressive Republican. Or in the scholastic phrase and term of Senator SIMEON D. FESS, of Ohio, he might be a pseudo-Republican, or, quoting from the more choice and refined expression of Senator George H. Moses, of New Hampshire, he might be classed among the wild jackasses. The only difference or line of demarcation today between a progressive Republican and a Democrat, is, that while both believe in Jefferson, Jackson, and Lincoln, the progressive Republicans do not manifest the same moral stamina or courage of their convictions as is characteristic of Democrats and men actuated from a conscientious realization of justice, duty, and right. Mr. Chairman, it is an old saying among

men that politics make strange bedfellows, and since the advent of woman suffrage and female candidates for office, and with new parties and political lines threatening and eminent, it is hard to pierce the veil of the future or predict with any assurance or certainty what might, might not, or could happen. [Applause and laughter.]

As Lincoln lived almost 70 years ago, it is difficult to realize and understand this lingering, persistent, antagonistic spirit of animosity, vituperation, and revenge manifested here in the House even to this day against Lincoln.

But, Mr. Chairman, even so as against Lincoln, I would resent this hostile attitude, this indignity against Abraham Lincoln more strenuously, vehemently, and with more determination than if directed personally against myself. [Applause.] And I take the further position here that this indignity toward Lincoln is a charge against the patriotic integrity of every Member of this House, both on this side of the aisle and against every Member on the other side, except this aggregation against Lincoln, who have forfeited all claim to either patriotism or integrity.

Mr. Chairman, a realization of right and duty prompts men to courage, resolution, and will, calling into strain and tension every sinew and fiber of the body, and arousing the latent powers of men to contend and battle for the right. And in such realization of a just cause, I stand ready to defend Lincoln from the traducers of his immortal character. [Applause.] And, actuated by such realization, I am not afraid of this aggregation. I challenge this aggregation. I defy this aggregation. [Applause.] And further actuated by such realization, I am ready to meet this aggregation in any proper or forensic contest, of measure of words, or résumé of history. In my zeal and determination to meet the calumniators of Abraham Lincoln, I would even consider a physical encounter; that is, with an aggregation of gentlemen, and I use the word advisedly and in its proper significance. I have no fear of the result of such an engagement with this aggregation, except in one very delicate consideration, and that is that these men are not in my class. And I realize I would suffer loss of prestige and dignity before my constituents and the country by stooping to meet them on their level. [Applause and laughter.]

If ever I fall so low in patriotism or in spirit of respect for Lincoln, I will resign my membership here and return to my district and there hie to the solitude in the depths of the jungle forest. And there where no eye can witness, where no ear can listen, where no tongue can tell, there in humiliation, remorse, and seclusion, in sack cloth and ashes, doing penance, there I would hide my face from the reproach of man and the piercing frown of the Almighty. [Applause and laughter.]

But, Mr. Chairman, I am glad that these belligerent Members have at last come to read from the handwriting on the wall and to realize their attitude before the country, the trend of scathing public opinion and the gathering storm of indignation, and this, too, in time to retract and face about, in their forced recognition of Lincoln, to save themselves from the wrath and censure of a wronged and misrepresented people.

But, Mr. Chairman, I am looking forward and not backward, looking upward and not downward, and I want to forgive and forget my colleagues in error and their indignity towards Lincoln. [Applause.]

And here I quote from Lincoln: "With charity for all and malice towards none," and I would ask unanimous consent to expunge these observations from the records as fully and as completely as if never made, if this hostile attitude and disrespect were only directed against me personally and without reflection upon or disparagement of the name and character of Lincoln. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, speaking of February 12, Lincoln's birthday, sometimes a tree stands higher, towering above the surrounding forests. Sometimes a star shines brighter, glowing in more brilliant luster from the gem-set canopy of the night time. Sometimes a man stands out from and above the masses and the multitude of his fellow men be-

cause of genius, talent, or great ability, or of some strength or force of character. Abraham Lincoln was such a man. Like a tree rising from the depths of the forest, he arose from the low level of poverty and want; from the life of the lowly, from the cabin, to high and exalted place and position. And like the star twinkling from the dim twilight, increasing in luster as the darkness gathers, his name grew brighter as the shadows fell until his life shown out like a beacon light before men, hung high to watch and follow. [Applause.]

It is a matter of history and common observation that the latent power of men often lay dormant and inactive until awakened, aroused, and developed by the conditions and emergencies of the time. Such was the latent mind force lying dormant in the fertile mind of Lincoln until aroused from mental lethargy by the rising irrepressible conflicts over involuntary servitude involving primary human rights, culminating in strife and mental struggle, and the clash of physical force in war. And it is the history of the lives and accomplishments of great men that one mental faculty of power is often developed or perfected to excel to the neglect, impairment, or exclusion of others. Abraham Lincoln possessed many virtues and accomplishments with other men, but he excelled or arose to high eminence by one supreme trait of character, by sacrificing devotion to one great principle predominating and engrossing mind and soul. [Applause.]

Abraham Lincoln was an honest man; but there has been many honest men, their honesty paving the way to obscurity and passed over in the annals of history, with name unsung, unheralded, and unknown. Abraham Lincoln was an able lawyer; but there has been many able jurists among men, possessed of equal and greater legal learning, and who have departed or passed on to live only in the resolutions of respect spread of record by the local bar. Abraham Lincoln was a sympathetic man, responsive to the simplicity and innocence of childhood, and was often touched to sadness and tears by the appeals of the unfortunate before him; but other men of like sympathetic nature and administering to all the charities that soothe, heal, and bless are forgotten by the beneficiaries of their charity and benevolence. And there are many other attributes of high character and fidelity of purpose which other men could measure equally with him, and claim honor and credit with him, and respect and confidence with him.

But there was this one great principle deeply, indelibly, and internally impressed upon the heart and in the mind and conscience of Lincoln and to which he was fervently devoted—the principle of liberty and freedom, of equal untrammelled human rights, the natural rights of the individual man. Lincoln looked upon mother earth and the people as her children. And he undertook to uphold and justify the natural impulses of motherhood high and above man-made law, her sacred sacrificing care for each and all without favoritism, preferment, and discrimination because of race, color, or condition of servitude. And looking upon the world and her people he declared the principle of human equality, the right of every man to take, shelter, and live from the bounteous bosom of mother earth, the right of every man to labor upon the earth to live, and to take and enjoy the fruits of that labor for his own support and maintenance and for those who by nature are dependent upon him.

Sometimes we are too near an object to see its form or measure its breadth and height, and we must go back for a perspective view. And during the contemporaneous time of Lincoln, Lincoln, his aims and accomplishments, were too near for a full view of his character or to measure or judge of his talents or worth. But today, looking at Abraham Lincoln back, down through the lapse of time, from the greater distance of the receding past and the light of events of the present, we can see and realize more of Lincoln. We can estimate more fully and accurately of his life and character and the true worth of his services, his course at the time and his insight into the future. And from which distance we are

brought to realize that Lincoln, contemplating the future almost 70 years ago, knew, realized, and comprehended more of the present than many men today can realize standing in the immediate presence of their own time.

At the time, contemporaneous with Lincoln, public opinion, public sentiment was divided. The issue of slavery, of human rights, has been determined by force and war, but might does not make or determine the right, nor conclude judgment in mind, heart, and conscience. But time is a great analyzer of facts. Time is a great demonstrator of truth. Time is a great vindicator of principles and men. Time in the great final analysis will tell. Time will consider a way and determine the right. We could not give the South today what their forefathers fought for less than 70 years ago. The generations of today would spurn such an offer with indignation and with resentment. They would take up arms, to resist, repel, the offer of what their forefathers fought for less than 70 years ago. Time has considered and rendered its verdict, both the North and the South are in unison, marching and waving banners together. The generations of today stand joining hands, pledging each other united allegiance forever. Time has decreed that Abraham Lincoln was right.

A Nation mourns Lincoln's tragic, untimely death. He struck the shackles from the black slave. But his work was not over, not completed. His heart still welled, his soul still burned in fervor for the rights of the lowly individual man. Before the light went out in Lincoln's life, his sad, serious, plaintive face reflecting the emotions struggling within, for the rights of the down-trodden and lowly, Lincoln in such meditative mood, said:

I see in the near future a crisis arising which unnerves me and causes me to tremble.

And continuing, Lincoln, admitting and deploring his mistake in the approval of the surrender of the constitutional power of Congress to issue and control the value of money, said:

The money power will (now) endeavor to prolong its reign working upon the prejudice of the people until all the wealth is aggregated into the hands of the few.

The struggle of the Civil War was over. But Lincoln was still thinking, reflecting, planning to rescue, retrieve, recover, and justify the rights of the lowly, individual man, and contemplating breaking the shackles from the white slave as well as the black slave.

And in this day and generation, when men are fawning to do the bidding of wealth and high social position; with great private banks of issue controlling the money supply of the country, the life currents in industry and trade; and the President and Congress of today begging, supplicating, imploring, before a frowning money monster, octopus, for the assent to use the people's own money, as vested by the Constitution in Congress and as delegated under the currency provisions of the relief act; with great financial and industrial corporations reveling in power and defying the authority of public officials and the Government itself, and with 90 percent of the wealth of the country aggregated into the hands of a few, it is fit and proper that we pause here to consider the life and character of Abraham Lincoln and his prophetic words uttered briefly before his death, and his prophecy and apprehension realized in the plight of the lowly individual man.

We are brought face to face today with Lincoln's foresight and warning and the fulfillment of his prophecy realized in the wealth of the country aggregated in the hands of the special few; with the reign of the money power prolonged, in a land of millionaires on one hand and millions of mendicants on the other; with the people gasping for economic breath; starving, freezing, suffering in despair in a land of plenty and great abundance. Even more than the issue of the great Civil War, even more than the issue of black slavery is the issue of white slavery today, the servitude of the helpless individual man, and the forces gathering to challenge his bondage in bloodshed, carnage, death, and destruction in the lurid, leaping flames of war. [Applause.]

With Lincoln's warning of yesterday unheeded, "No Nation can long endure half slave and half free", we are reading from this panic and depression, standing out in bold, flaming relief the handwriting on the wall foreboding civil chaos, anarchy, and revolution. This administration is standing in the presence of Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson and the immortal spirit of Abraham Lincoln, all speaking in one language, all calling in one voice, all protesting against the surrender of the constitutional power over money, and all imploring us to recover back to Congress from money-mad financiers and bankers, the misers, Shylocks, and money changers of today, the surrendered power, to coin money and regulate the value thereof, and to rescue and salvage civilization from a relapse of the Dark Ages. [Applause.]

Mr. SINCLAIR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BLANCHARD].

Mr. BLANCHARD. Mr. Chairman, a few days ago this House created a special committee on conservation of wild life, and in passing I want to touch upon the possible program of that committee as incidental to what I shall say later on. Likewise, within the past few days there has come to our attention the report of the Special Committee on Conservation, which was appointed by the President, in which it is stated that the committee has in mind the acquisition of 5,000,000 acres of land, so-called "marginal lands", that may be turned back into conservation channels. It is said by Mr. Darling, who was one of the members of the President's committee, that it would require two men to handle each 1,000 acres. I have computed the cost on the basis of \$1,200 per man and find that if such a program is adopted, it would require an annual appropriation of \$12,000,000 to pay these men their salaries, without any accounting for maintenance cost and equipment allowance. I mention that because however we may enthuse about the proposed program for conservation of wild life, we must of necessity consider the future cost and more especially the probability of carrying on continuously a program of that character.

Then, in connection with the taking over of these so-called "marginal lands" for conservation purposes, I make reference to the policy of the country in the past where we have drained marshes, irrigated lands, and reclaimed lands, and still are doing so, in face of the fact that nature and the study of nature, and natural conditions should teach us that as a national policy that can lead only to destruction.

In 1930 we appropriated \$7,798,000 for irrigation and reclamation. In 1931 we appropriated \$9,047,000 for the same purpose; in 1932, \$6,971,000; in 1933, \$2,441,000; and in 1934, \$3,003,000. In other words, the ordinary Budget shows in the past year for 1934, \$3,003,000, but in addition to that amount there must be taken into account \$109,000,000 which was appropriated through the P.W.A., which means that the correct figure, regardless of any budget set-up that one may have in mind, must be \$3,003,000 plus \$109,000,000.

Here is what I am driving at. Shall we, as a matter of national policy, continue drainage, irrigation, and reclamation on the huge scale that we have known in the past, in view of the proposed expenditure of \$25,000,000 to reclaim for wild-life conservation activities some of those same areas?

I pass now, briefly, to the subject of cotton, dairy, and sugar, and in that connection read from the statement made by Secretary of Agriculture Wallace in which he says that he leans to the middle and international sides of the case, referring to the three alternatives that we have before us today—first, nationalism; second, internationalism; and, third, Secretary Wallace's so-called "middle-ground" program. He says that there are good arguments on all sides, and that is why he wants you and me and all of us to think about the problems. He believes the future welfare of serving the country and people alike depends upon deciding it rightly.

In other words, he has not come to any definite conclusion as to what is proper and correct. He has not come to

any conclusion that his program for the control of cotton and the control of dairy surpluses nor the allocation of sugar is the right course that we should pursue at the present time. He has said within the past few days that he believes quotas must be definitely fixed in sugar. Let me read his words:

Secretary of Agriculture Wallace told the Senate Finance Committee yesterday he had no intention of destroying the domestic sugar industry, but that quotas would have to be applied. He recommended allocations of portions of sugar demand to the various producing areas, and urged the inclusion of such a clause in the Costigan bill to make sugar a basic commodity, set up production quotas, levy a processing tax with which to compensate for reduced acreage, and thus open the way for tariff modifications calculated to restore life to Cuba's shattered economy.

Then I read the statement of the President immediately following the conference which was had between the President, Senator ALVA ADAMS, Senator ROBINSON of Arkansas, and Representative TAYLOR of Colorado. At least the President was quoted as having made the statement in the press:

The President made it clear to us that any inference that might have been drawn from the testimony of Mr. Weaver, of the Department of Agriculture, before the House Committee on Agriculture, that the administration was hostile to the beet-sugar industry, were without foundation. He assured us that Mr. Weaver did not express his sentiment and that only he, the President, and the Secretary of Agriculture were authorized to define administration policies.

The President displayed a sympathetic attitude toward the sugar States, and at the conclusion of our conference personally telephoned to the Department of Agriculture suggestion for modifications of the pending legislation designed to meet some of the conditions which we described. Amendments to the pending legislation will be drafted after conference between representatives of the sugar-producing States and the Secretary of Agriculture, which we are hopeful will meet the problem that confronts us.

I mention that since it takes on a peculiar significance when we consider what we are faced with at the present time in the sugar industry and likewise takes on peculiar significance when we consider what we are face to face with in the cotton industry. I now read briefly from an article in yesterday's Star, written by Mark Sullivan, on the subject of collectivism. I do not agree with the article in toto, but there are some statements to which I can subscribe, and I point out just exactly the process of evolution that we face at the present time:

The first step turns out to be a mistake, or at least not successful. But what happens? Does the administration turn back? Not at all—it is the law of revolutions that they go forward and that the first step makes the second inevitable—those who promote the revolution understand this and take advantage of it.

We are just now on the threshold of the second step. It departs from voluntary action by the farmers (which was the first step) and introduces compulsion. The cotton raisers are to be compelled to reduce their crops—the bill is in Congress and it has the endorsement of President Roosevelt.

The bill contemplates that in the spring of each year the Secretary of Agriculture shall fix the amount of cotton to be raised in the whole country. With the amount for the whole country fixed, a quota is set for each State; within each State a quota is set for each county; within each county a quota is set for each farm—at the beginning of the season a Government agent will tell each farmer that he is to raise so many bales of cotton and no more.

In the first draft of the bill the Government's compulsion was to be achieved by fine and imprisonment—any farmer raising more than his quota would be subject to 60 days' imprisonment and \$500 fine. Consideration seems to have suggested that this is rather too early a stage of the revolution to introduce imprisonment as a penalty for infraction of orders from Washington. In the present phase of the bill the compulsion upon the farmer is to be achieved by putting a prohibitive tax upon the extra bale or bales, a tax amounting to the total value of the cotton.

What the third step will be no one knows. "No one," that is, except the radicals at Washington. I suspect the third step, or at least one of the early steps, will be price-fixing; the same Government agent who in the spring tells the farmer how much cotton he may raise will in the summer or fall tell him the price that he is to be paid for it.

As to the further steps, we can only speculate. We know, however, what the objective is—Russia, and we know the Russian system.

I suspect an early step will be to apply the economic theory that since only a limited amount of cotton is to be raised it should be raised on that soil upon which cotton can be raised with least expense. This soil is to be found mainly west of the Mississippi River; and this process, logically carried out, will mean that substantially all the cotton will be raised in Texas, Louisiana, and Arkansas. When and if the process reaches the point at which

the eastern cotton States—the Carolinas, Georgia, Alabama, Virginia, and Tennessee—are abandoned for cotton-raising purposes, at that point, or before it, I suspect, will arise the political opposition that should interrupt the progress of the revolution.

I say I do not subscribe to these statements in toto, but they do indicate pretty clearly what the trend is in the agricultural field and other fields of industry.

Mr. MCFADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANCHARD. I yield.

Mr. MCFADDEN. I have noticed that the Secretary of Agriculture is engaging in the publication of a series of articles along this line now. Inasmuch as those articles are copyrighted by the Foreign Policy Association and the World Peace Foundation, and from other evidences disclosed in his addresses from time to time, it indicates that he has an international idea, and he is following much of the corporate form of state of the communistic Italian plan of government.

Mr. BLANCHARD. I quoted from one of those same articles to which you make reference.

Now, turning again to sugar, it has been covered in an excellent manner this morning by the gentleman from Michigan, and I was very much interested in his statements. I want to pursue the argument one step further. I want to talk about a section of our country which is vitally interested in the sugar industry, namely, Michigan, Ohio, Indiana, and Wisconsin. May I say to you that none of these States named is first in importance when it comes to the sugar production of this country. I think Colorado ranks first. Idaho is an important beet sugar producing State. Other sections of this great country are vitally interested in the subject, but to give you a definite picture of what this proposed allocation means, the quota basis, I want to use these figures as applied to the four States I have mentioned.

There are 22 plants in the four States. Acres contracted, 262,000; acres harvested, 218,000. That is this last campaign year. Tons of beets to be paid for, 1,744,000; number of farmers, 29,000; number of beet workers, 26,393; number of factory workers, 7,505; number of field men, 156; number of weighmen, tare men, and yardmen, 944; number of office employees, 167; number of administrative employees, 55.

Amount paid to beet workers, \$2,210,000; amount paid to factory workers, \$2,143,000; amount paid to field men, \$236,909; amount paid to weighmen, tare men, and yardmen, \$152,902; amount paid to office and administration employees, \$314,000.

Bags of sugar produced, 4,691,288; tons of pulp produced, 90,000; tons of molasses produced, 56,000.

Value of sugar at 4.25 cents net, \$19,963,000, in round numbers; value of pulp at \$15 a net ton, \$1,356,000; value of molasses at \$6 net, \$341,815.

Barrels of fuel oil used, 243,000; tons of coal used, 254,348; tons of coke used, 11,490; tons of limerock, 113,000; square yards of filter cloth, 312,000; sugar bags used, 4,723,000; pulp bags used, 1,652,000.

Value of chemicals and laboratory supplies used, \$129,000; value of materials and miscellaneous supplies used, \$1,753,000; amount paid to truckers in transporting beets, \$822,000; amount paid to railroads for transporting beets, \$344,704; amount paid to trucks and railroads for transporting supplies, \$775,000; amount paid to trucks and railroads for transporting sugar, pulp, and molasses, \$1,300,000; amount paid for all taxes—State, local, and Federal—\$430,000; all this out of an industry confined to four States alone. If you want to use that as a basis to determine the amount of money that is paid annually over the whole United States, not only to the farmers and laborers of this country, both directly and indirectly, and for transportation costs, coal, and supplies, you can readily see the vastness of this great industry from the standpoint of the American producer.

Mr. KELLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANCHARD. I yield.

Mr. KELLER. What other States produce beet sugar, and to what extent?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BLANCHARD] has expired.

Mr. SINCLAIR. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 10 additional minutes.

Mr. BLANCHARD. I can only give the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KELLER] a comparative statement. I have not prepared a complete statement, as I have with regard to these four States, because I did not have an opportunity to do so; but on sugar beets I gave those States so that you can readily understand from a productive basis how great an enterprise it is. On the basis of the figures for 1932, Ohio harvested 26,000 acres; Michigan, 121,000; for Wisconsin the figures are not given; Nebraska, 66,000; Montana, 56,000; Idaho, 53,000; Wyoming, 40,000; Colorado, 159,000; Utah, 57,000; California, 104,000; other States, 86,000; or a total of 713,000 acres.

Let me make this statement to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KELLER], and I think he will gather just exactly what I mean. We produced, in 1933, 1,706,000 tons of beet sugar in the United States. Under the proposed bill we will lose, under the quota basis, approximately 300,000 tons of refined beet sugar, and that tonnage will go to Cuba and the Philippines and other island possessions.

It means striking off anywhere from 16 to 20 percent of the production in continental United States, and, of course, on the basis of the figures I have given for these four States, it means wiping out 16 to 20 percent of the acreage, 16 to 20 percent of the amount paid the farmers, the laborers, men in the various industries closely related to the sugar industry.

Mr. CANNON of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANCHARD. I yield.

Mr. CANNON of Wisconsin. What quick remedy has the gentleman to suggest to protect the American sugar industry? I mean a quick remedy.

Mr. BLANCHARD. It will occur to the gentleman immediately when I make the statement that first of all I would kill H.R. 7907, which is a bill to include sugar beets and sugarcane as basic agricultural commodities under the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and for other purposes.

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

Mr. BLANCHARD. I yield.

Mr. MILLARD. Is this the industry about which Secretary Wallace, testifying before the Finance Committee of the Senate, stated that if he had his way he would put it out of business?

Mr. BLANCHARD. I do not believe the Secretary of Agriculture used those exact words.

Mr. MILLARD. He is quoted in the press as having said that last week.

Mr. BLANCHARD. It is true he made a statement to that effect.

Mr. MILLARD. This is the industry to which he referred.

Mr. BLANCHARD. Referring to the sugar industry he said it never should have been in existence in the United States, or words to that effect.

Further answering the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. CANNON], with all due respect to the President of the United States, with all due respect to the Secretary of Agriculture, with all due respect to Professor Tugwell and Professor Weaver, I want to say in no uncertain terms that this bill H.R. 7907 should meet with the violent opposition of all parties, Democrats, Republicans, and the Farmer-Laborites, as well.

The bill has no justification whatsoever. There is no surplus production of sugar in this country. The sugar industry is large and can stand upon its own feet. It is an industry which, by its very nature, has not gouged the consuming public of America. On at least one bill we ought to be able to unite in the interest of American agriculture. It is important that we unite in the defeat of this bill, for if 1,000,000 acres of highly productive, rich land is taken from the production of sugar beets in this country, quite naturally it cannot be classified as submarginal and it will go into the production of other farm products, to the end that the surpluses in some of those lines will be increased rather than diminished.

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

Mr. BLANCHARD. I yield.

Mr. HEALEY. What will be the effect of this legislation upon the large sugar-refining units on the eastern seaboard?

Mr. BLANCHARD. May I say in answer that the eastern seaboard is not the only place where there are sugar refineries. Many sugar refineries have gone to Cuba, contrary to the original intent of the American people.

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at this point for a question?

Mr. BLANCHARD. Certainly.

Mr. HEALEY. It is my understanding that at least in the East the sugar refineries are paying N.R.A. wages, or a minimum of 50 cents an hour, whereas in Cuba similar labor receives but 50 cents a day. Are my figures correct?

Mr. BLANCHARD. The gentleman's figures are correct. I read now a very brief statement from a letter received from an individual back in my home county:

Due to a loophole in our present tariff law, a number of the islands, including Cuba, have gone into the refining business, and in 1933 these islands shipped 626,598 long tons of refined sugar into the United States against 16,782 long tons in 1925, an increase of 609,816 long tons, or a sufficient amount of refined sugar for approximately 14,000,000 Americans, which is very unfair, as we cannot compete with Cuba and work under the N.R.A. codes.

I think that answers the gentleman perfectly.

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

Mr. BLANCHARD. I yield.

Mr. KENNEY. Sugar is refined in a number of parts of the country.

Mr. BLANCHARD. Yes; in the four States mentioned there are 22 such refineries.

Mr. KENNEY. The gentleman realizes, I suppose, that the welfare of the sugarcane and sugarbeet growers depends somewhat upon the success of the domestic sugar refineries?

Mr. BLANCHARD. Quite naturally.

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

Mr. BLANCHARD. I yield.

Mr. KELLER. Where can I get the arguments against this phase of the bill specifically stated? I should like to understand it. Has it been made in a specific way?

Mr. BLANCHARD. The gentleman means the argument for the bill?

Mr. KELLER. Yes.

Mr. BLANCHARD. The Senate committee is conducting hearings at the present time, and some statements have been made before the House Committee on Agriculture. The hearings of the House Committee on Agriculture have not been concluded. So I imagine in due time we will have reports from both Houses.

Mr. KELLER. Is it necessary to beat the whole bill to beat this phase of it?

Mr. BLANCHARD. The bill deals primarily with sugar as a basic commodity. I am not referring to the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill; I am referring to another bill. The Department of Agriculture appropriation bill is now before the House, but under the rules governing general debate I am permitted to talk on any subject, and I am talking on H.R. 7907, the so-called "Jones-Costigan bill."

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

Mr. BLANCHARD. I yield.

Mr. HAINES. I am very much interested in the gentleman's statement relative to refineries. In the State of Pennsylvania, particularly around Philadelphia, we have perhaps the largest refining industry in the United States. I understand they employ perhaps more men and women than any other industry in the city of Philadelphia. They are quite concerned about this bill and have come to see me about it. I wish to compliment the gentleman for giving the House the information he has.

Mr. BLANCHARD. It is true not only of Philadelphia and Pennsylvania but of many other States of the Union which are interested vitally in the production of sugarcane and sugarbeet, and in the refining of raw sugar. This bill strikes at the very foundations of the industry. If the present bill is allowed to pass, I say positively and without fear of successful contradiction that it will prove to be the enter-

ing wedge for the destruction of one of the best industries we have in America.

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

Mr. BLANCHARD. I yield.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. If we have the power to curtail acreage, have we not also the power to fix prices?

Mr. BLANCHARD. Of course, the gentleman is referring to a statement I read, which was a quotation. I am not questioning the power.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I want to get that cleared up, because the gentleman made the statement.

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

Mr. McFADDEN. Mre Chairman, the gentleman has made a very important speech. If he has not the right to insert in the RECORD some of the things he was quoting from, I ask unanimous consent that he may put into the RECORD such articles he has quoted from as are material to this particular subject.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SANDLIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield one half of a minute to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. WILLFORD].

Mr. WILLFORD. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Wild Life Committee I made a speech over the radio last Friday evening, and I ask unanimous consent to have the address inserted in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLFORD. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech made by me over the radio last Friday evening:

Friends of the radio audience, a year ago I spoke to you regarding the cleaning-up and antipollution of the great Potomac River. I am back tonight with the same message. I am more than duty-bound at the present time to come to you, as just recently the House of Representatives appointed a committee called the "Wild Life Committee", of which I am a member, and we are trying to bring to you some message that will help you see the picture as it is. I am greatly interested in pure streams. I have seen terrible desecration caused by pollution, not willfully, but unthinkingly.

In my own State of Iowa, and especially around my home town of Waterloo, I have had the privilege and opportunity of becoming acquainted with the streams and forests of my State. At one time it was the pride and joy of everyone, but it has now become a State of polluted streams, desecrated forests, and all because selfish interests in the field of industry have seen fit to use our beautiful streams as a dumping ground for by-products and waste material. This alone has caused the death of thousands and thousands of fish and small game because of the impurity of the streams. My entire life has been spent in the State of Iowa, and I have seen the streams and woods become a dumping ground and a graveyard for fish and game. It makes me sad to see this condition. The problem of conservation may seem small to some of you, but ladies and gentlemen, one of the most important problems of our Nation is the conservation of our wild life, forests, and fish.

I plead with you to use every bit of influence you can to bring this to the attention of those in charge and to make a super-human effort to make our waters as clean as they were when our forefathers came to this country. The great Potomac River, made famous with song and story, is one of the most richly historic spots in the Western Hemisphere; history is written on both sides from beginning to end. We should worship this river as it has been our savior. I have gone along the banks and have seen slugs of pollution coming from the city of Washington for many miles down the stream, and it makes my heart ache to think people would be so thoughtless to allow this condition to continue. Washington, with its half a million population, has many children who have to play out of doors, and they must have recreation. Let us make it possible so they may be able to fish, swim, and play about in a clean river. It is up to us, friends, to see that this is brought about. We must teach children to respect the whole picture, the flowers, trees, birds, and animals. Our little animals are not wild, and our birds are not wild, but it is we, ourselves, that are wild. I have seen many cases where birds and animals become fast friends and companions with the man who spends his time in the woods just through friendship; and when they once learn we are their friends, they will reciprocate by returning it many times. It is up to us. Let us not just talk about it; let us do it. The time has come when there is a shortage, when our woods and waters are almost depleted of that which is beautiful, and it is time to start now to preserve some of that which is left and bring it back to its original state as God intended it to be. Friends, you never see a counterfeit in the great out-of-

doors. It is only when man takes charge and tries to reproduce or change, desecrate, and spoil the complexion and looks of things that is a counterfeit beyond the question of a doubt. The counterfeit is always the sure sign of a genuine article. All people enjoy nature. There are very few who do not enjoy a beautiful sunset or sunrise, the hills, trees, waters, and flowers. The Government has allocated a sum of money which makes it possible for cities to build sewage-disposal plants, incinerators, and made it possible for boys to reforest our denuded forests, build dams in small creeks so that water may be backed up to sustain fish life and multiply food supply and stop erosion in many places so that after a hard rain mud and slush flow to the river to be carried on down to the sea. Our Government is doing a wonderful thing in helping us try to prepare and take care of that which our great Creator gave us.

Our President has seen fit and can see into the future far enough and has made it possible for us to try to bring back to its original state, a place to play. It is not entirely recreation but is a humane act as well, so that we, as fathers and mothers, may be able to send our children to swim in the rivers, lakes, and creeks without having them come home with diseases of the nose, ears, and throat, and skin diseases caused by pollution of the stream. Any reputable doctor in the land will tell you that is where most of these generate and originate. We are becoming conscious of the fact that the word "conservation" means more than just so many letters thrown together. It means the salvation of this country if anything in the world does. We must conserve, and that which we have started that brings happiness to our hearts, must go on. If we had more of our boys and girls playing in the great out-of-doors, there would be less racketeering and crime. If the men who are committing so many crimes all over the land today, in their younger days had the privilege of playing out of doors, I believe crime would be on the decrease instead of on the increase. Nothing brings more peace and happiness than to be able to enjoy that pure environment where one can commune with his God, where one is able to see the genuine, all around. I ask you mothers and fathers to talk conservation when you have your family gathered together, play conservation and impress it upon the minds of your children. There is so much satisfaction in it, and the greatest monument you can build for your family is to teach them to play clean, think clean, and to keep the places our Creator left clean. Let us all play fair with nature. Our Boy Scouts are taught nature study, and they are the ones whom we must rely on for our next leaders of this Nation. Let us as men help the boys as they come to the age of maturity to be prepared by having a full knowledge of the great out-of-doors. Good night!

Mr. SANDLIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. SWANK].

Mr. SWANK. Mr. Chairman, when we entered the World War, we were told that it was done to end all wars and to make the world safe for democracy. The armistice was signed November 11, 1918, and the war officially ended by resolution of Congress July 2, 1921. On account of the great carnage and destruction caused by the World War our people have been trying to devise means and methods of preventing future wars, so far as the United States is concerned.

Before the United States enters another war, except in case of imminent invasion, why should not that question be submitted to a vote of our people and let a majority rule, the same as any other question? This is a most important question for the people of the United States, and it seems that they should have a right to vote as to whether or not they want to engage in and send our boys to another war. A most precious right of an individual is the right of self-defense; that is, of using such means as are necessary to preserve his life and save himself from bodily injury. This same principle applies to nations, and a country has the right to fight in its own necessary self-defense, and the people of the United States would vote for a war for this purpose. Let the mothers have a vote on the question of sending their boys to war. They are patriotic and will always do their full duty.

The disastrous results of the last war are still fresh in the minds of our people, and we certainly do not want to engage in another war if it can possibly be prevented. There are some, of course, who agitate war, and others who make great profits when we engage in war. In the last war we saw the greatest army that was ever assembled under any flag. The boys were taken from every farm, shop, city, town, village, and hamlet. Not a home in the United States but was affected by the World War. The cost of that war was tremendous, and the burden of taxation as the result of it will never be lifted from the back of the youngest child now living. But, Mr. Chairman, that is not the worst part of the war. We see millions of our boys maimed and disabled

for life. They cannot get jobs, and their compensation and pensions have been taken away from them in thousands of cases.

Unearned billions of dollars filled the coffers of the profiteers in the World War—profiteers who made bullets, guns, and other implements of warfare and who furnished clothing and supplies. We hear much about taking the profits out of war, and the best way to take the profits out of future wars is to take the profits out of the last war. So far as I am concerned, Mr. Chairman, I stand where I have always stood, and that is to take care of the disabled soldiers and their dependents, and let the burden of that care fall upon those who profited so much in money by the great war. Let them pay an income tax and let it be understood that, in case of another war, they will not profit a penny.

In the last session of Congress I opposed the bill that struck so many of our disabled soldiers and their dependents from the compensation and pension rolls, because I believed it to be a great injustice to them. I was proud of that vote then, and I am proud of it now. I shall never permit myself to lift my voice or raise my hand against those who wore the uniform in any war in which the United States was engaged. On the other hand, I have always supported legislation in behalf of our soldiers and their dependents and shall continue in that direction. The big interests and those who are opposed to compensation and pensions for our soldiers can oppose me all they like, but they shall not deter me in the least in my support of our disabled soldiers nor lead me from the path of duty as it appears clear before me. I gladly supported the bill which enabled our war mothers to visit the graves of their sons who were buried in France.

On the 4th day of January 1934 I introduced the American Legion four-point program and am actively supporting that program. I hope to see full benefits to our disabled soldiers restored.

In the Seventy-second Congress I voted for the bill to pay in cash the adjusted-service certificates to our soldiers by the issuance of sound currency for that purpose. The Federal Reserve banks can be authorized, as can be the Treasury Department, to issue notes against these adjusted-service certificates and pay this just debt. In addition to the justness of the debt much new money will be put into circulation by such action, and the present emergency will be greatly relieved thereby. I have signed the motion to discharge the committee from the consideration of the bill to pay the adjusted-service certificates and bring it to the floor of the House for a vote. I hope the bill will be enacted into law this session, this just debt paid, and the question settled. It must be paid sometime, and why not now when the money is so greatly needed?

The payment of these adjusted-service certificates will put \$2,400,000,000 into circulation at once without increasing taxes a penny. It will go into every nook and corner of the United States, and every neighborhood will be affected thereby.

If this bill should be enacted into law, the following amounts of money will be distributed in the Fifth Congressional District that I have the honor to represent in the American Congress:

Payne County.....	\$613,361
Logan County.....	461,387
Oklahoma County.....	3,685,285
Cleveland County.....	414,635
McCain County.....	358,576
Garvin County.....	521,884
Murray County.....	206,254
Total for the State of Oklahoma.....	39,822,184

The money cost of the World War to the United States June 30, 1933, amounted to the enormous sum of \$40,583,000,000. The obligations of foreign governments to the United States November 15, 1933, amounted to \$11,888,058,973.91. Payment on these debts as of the same date amounted to the sum of \$2,737,707,104.88. The gross debt of the United States January 31, 1934, amounted to \$25,068,052,506.17. Some of those countries who were allied with us during the World War are now using the money they owe us to build the greatest armies and navies they have ever had.

Mr. Chairman, the sending of American soldiers to foreign countries to protect private investments might lead us into war, and I am opposed to these soldiers' being sent to those countries for that purpose. If an American citizen has a large amount of money to invest in a foreign country, and does so invest it, he should do so at his own peril, subject to the laws of that country and any eventuality occurring. If a humble American citizen should invest a small amount in a foreign country and a revolution should come along and destroy his property, no soldiers would be sent there to protect his property, and they should not be sent there for that purpose. We cannot afford the destruction caused by a great war on account of the protection of property. Human lives are more sacred than property rights, and one American boy is worth more than all foreign investments.

There is no American whose heart does not thrill at the achievements of American soldiers upon the field of battle. No one can visit Chateau-Thierry and ascend the little hill at Belleau Wood and not be stirred with emotion when he thinks of the bravery shown by our own soldiers. At this place the first battle our boys fought was against the best that Germany had. This was the first set-back to German arms, when they met the boys from America and were driven from the Wood. Mr. Chairman, a different feeling comes over us, however, when we go down on the other side and see the hundreds of little white crosses marking the silent and sleeping dust of American boys—boys who died in a foreign land and are now sleeping beneath alien skies, never more to be seen by their families and their friends. When we think of these, then it is that we are stronger than ever in our belief that something should be done that another war may never occur.

If we are ever engaged in another war and it becomes necessary to draft men, we should enact legislation, and do it now, that will draft money and property also the same as our boys are drafted. I should like to see such legislation enacted now before this session of Congress adjourns. I have always worked in this direction and am going to continue my best efforts to minimize the cause of war. I hope and trust that no living American shall ever live to see the day when we are engaged in another war. At this point I wish to congratulate the American mothers who are doing such an effective work by trying to stamp out the cause of war. They are the ones who suffer most and whose hearts are left wounded and bleeding by such human destruction.

Oh, the bravest battle that ever was fought;
Shall I tell you where and when?
On the maps of the world you will find it not;
'Twas fought by the mothers of men.
'Twas not with cannon or battle shot,
With sword or noble pen;
'Twas not with eloquent word or thought,
From lips of wonderful men;
But deep in a welled-up woman's heart;
A woman who would not yield,
But bravely, silently bore her part—
Lo, there is that battlefield.

[Applause.]

Mr. SANDLIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. McCLINTIC].

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Chairman, for over a quarter of a century a famous old building, called the "Congress Hall Hotel", housed a great many Members of Congress and their families. Recently, on the 18th of this month, some 250 former guests of this famous institution met for the purpose of having a reunion and going over some of the happy days gone by. A very lovely program was presented under the leadership of Mrs. Edward Taylor, the wife of a distinguished Member of this body. The Vice President of the United States and others delivered very interesting talks on this occasion, and as a part of the program Mrs. Chalmers, the wife of a distinguished ex-Member of Congress, prepared a report along poetical lines which refers to many Members of Congress and other guests. This has been handed to me with the suggestion that it be printed in order that the newer Members may have some idea of what took place in days of long ago.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to include as a part of my remarks the report that was made by Mrs. Chalmers on that occasion. [Applause.]

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

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

BLESSED DAYS OF YORE

From town or thriving city,
From village or hamlet small,
The high, the low,
They all did go
To dwell in Congress Hall.

And see them change from timid folks
To self-assertive ones.
It gave them sand
To know the land;
Proclaimed them chosen sons.

A self-sustaining group was that,
Of foreign trade no need.
For Garnered there
Was talent rare
About which you may read.

They even had their own good Parks,
And a Taylor of renown.
He set the style
For clothes worth while
In a Colorado town.

No crafty plumber need apply,
For pipes that act like Cain;
In zero days
They found it pays
To have a perfect Drane.

If boy or man did need a shave,
A Barbour trim and neat
Was right on hand,
With stories grand,
With old Prince to compete.

When chauffeur you were lacking,
For your brand new model car,
A Driver fair
Was always there
To take you near or far.

A most humane community,
Where each one did his part.
No feeble cry
Did they pass by,
For there they had a Hart.

A man resembling Bryan
Went in and out the door.
A goodly wife,
So full of life,
One ne'er had seen before.

And there were those delightful Leas
Who had a closet big
Enough to hold,
So we are told,
One Sumner's evening rig.

Get her to tell the story
When you are sad or low;
Your sides will quake,
With laughter shake,
And tears of joy will flow.

From out the Empire State there came
No weak nor broken Reed;
A stalwart one,
A chosen son,
To serve his country's need.

A sense of real security
Prevailed throughout the Hall;
We'd rest our case
Without a trace
Of fear with Judge McCall.

Came a Doctor from the New York State,
From the town no one can spell,
He won a place
With his smiling face,
And he won a handsome Belle.

There were Lloyd and fair Luella,
Cassius and his sweet wife.
And the Gifford folks
With Cape Cod jokes,
All added to the life.

There was Robinson of the Senate
With his dear, sweet mother-in-law.
There were Fulmers five
All much alive,
And Fullers from Arkansas.

Ramseyers from the State of Iowa,
And Lanham, the poet, was there;
The Milligans, too,
And Roy Knabenshue,
A high flyer he—in the air.

Am I forgetting George Stimson,
An author of no little fame.
A family named Rose?
Oh, how the list grows!
'Twas there the Dickinsons came.

No matter how cold the weather without,
We always had Summers within.
Their girls then were small,
When in Congress Hall,
And our hearts they proceeded to win.

There was dainty little Emma Louise
And bright Mrs. Leatherwood;
And Oscar Bland
From Hoosier land,
And the Crisps, both clever and good.

There was likable Mattie Porter
And Moore, McNelly, and Price;
There was Jessie, petite,
Whom no one can beat,
And Marvin, a gentleman, nice.

The Blanton family came along
And brought sweet Ann and Joe;
There was Adam, the giant,
And sweet Lady Wyant
Among those we used to know.

We are not forgetting Al Carter,
Who came from 'way out West;
All the girls made eyes
At the bachelor guys,
But they loved George Ward the best.

There was Charley, who danced like a fairy
And called all the circles with vim;
There was lovely Nell Swing,
Whom Philip did bring,
And how the men all envied him.

The Arnolds were there with their children,
The Keatings whom all did admire;
Iowa sent Greene
To add to the scene,
And from Kansas there came to us Guyer.

The Stengles and Staleys and Gregory
And Johnson—one Luther quite tall;
In the Mondell suite
There were pattering feet,
For the Mondell kiddies were small.

From the Empire State, Elmira,
The Stalker folks did come;
The Baity pair
And the Hogans there
All came to make their home.

Oh! little we thought when in Dinty's,
We saw John Garner at play.
In such a short time
Our good John would climb
To the high place he holds today.

There was Leader Joe Byrns, from Nashville,
And McClintic, Oklahoma's good son;
Annie Laurie in curls,
The sweetest of girls,
And cute Mrs. Rankin and John.

Just turn your eye to the leaders
Who are lending a powerful hand;
There are Rainey and Byrns,
And soon one learns
Congress Hall is ruling the land.

The Shallenbergers we were glad to claim,
Grace Adair and her good man, John.
The Wingos four,
And through the door
Came the family of DeRouen.

From the "Show Me" State came Mrs. McClure,
The Cochrans right up with the times.
Two charming ones
Were the Whittingtons;
There was Griffin, a writer of rhymes.

The Hoopers were guests from farther north,
From the "Wolverine" State they came;
Mrs. Watson and Bob
Were right on the job,
And Bradley a popular dame.

The Brunswicks, the Pattons, and Steagalls
Helped give everyone a good time;
And Boehne, whose son
His seat now has won,
Must have a real seat in this rhyme.

The Williams came from Illinois,
Two sweet girls they brought,
Alice and Ruth;
And I speak the truth,
When I say they had been well taught.

What a crowd would always gather
When Hefin started to tell
His stories grand,
Of "Darkie Land";
He told "Dat Ham Bone" well.

The beautiful teas the women gave
With a hundred ladies in line;
When they said, "We're at home"
The whole city did come,
'Twas a thing one would never decline.

And assisting would be Emma Collier
And Laura and sweet Irma Strong.
Judge Tarver was there,
With ministerial air;
The McReynolds, too, came along.

And Mesdames Freisinger and Willis,
The Vinsons so jolly and gay;
And Freddie, like dad,
Was always glad
To make a good speech, by the way.

The Davises, loved by everyone,
Came there from Tennessee.
Buchanans and Beers,
And from Florida Sears,
Bill Clark, a great wit was he.

The McKeowns, O'Connors, and Hastings,
Good Indians everyone.
And there did dwell
None to excel
The Hadleys of Washington.

The Elliots and the Sawyers,
The Sandlins we all adored;
The McDuffie three
We there did see,
And Chandler who drove a Ford.

Narration well could fill a book
Of the folks we used to know.
Outstanding they
To this very day,
The ones who there did go.

ENDING

And as we look back across the years
To those glorious days gone by.
There might have been
No happy grin,
No song without our "Cy."

Oh, happy day that fixed our choice
On this homelike abode;
A friend to man
Was sure the plan
Of this house by the side of the road.

Far more than stone and mortar,
Far more than wood or glass,
None can compare
With friends made there,
A dream life come to pass.

The editor appends a note as follows:

If perchance there should be one
Whose name did not appear,
I promise that he
Shall lauded be,
In the issue I print next year.

—MRS. W. W. CHALMERS.

Mr. SANDLIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. EAGLE].

Mr. EAGLE. Mr. Chairman, I want to talk about a subject that affects almost every congressional district in the

United States, and I respectfully request that during the brief time allotted to me I be not interrupted by questions, because I want to develop a theme.

I want to talk about the Milk Administration. It happens that the Milk Administration is ruining my dairying constituents, and accordingly I took an interest in the matter. Two of us Congressmen met, and, after conferring 2 or 3 days, induced 40 additional gentlemen to meet with us in conference. These 40 gentlemen conferred one evening and called a larger meeting, and 124 Congressmen met in caucus. It happens that because I used one or two words that seemed not to have been relished by the gentlemen of the Milk Administration, I have been singled out for a statement leveled at me in the form of an Associated Press interview by the Milk Administration, inviting me to make comments in reply. In compliance with their appreciated invitation, there are certain things that I want to lay before the House.

This is the first time I think in 15 years that a Congressman's name has been used excoriatingly by a department of the Government which we select and which we by appropriations support. In criticizing me, if I am to be immolated on the altar of duty, I accept this role in humility, but with resignation and courage. It happens that the 124 gentlemen from every section and from 40 States in the Union who conferred last Friday night almost without exception, in private conversation and in speeches which they made, spoke of the lack of consideration that they had received from Mr. Tugwell and his subordinates, and also spoke of the universal complaints they had from their milk producers and distributors and also from the consuming public. Many of them spoke of the theorists in the Milk Administration. Many of them spoke of the impractical visionaries that were undertaking to administer a law we enacted. But the Milk Administration has no objection, it seems, to being called impractical or to being called visionaries or to being called injurious to the milk industry of the Nation, which is a \$6,000,000,000 industry.

I happened to use, in plain speech, the term "communistic", and it seems this is tremendously disturbing to the gentlemen who, "dressed in a little brief authority, cut such fantastic tricks before high heavens as make the angels weep." When a gentleman speaks and writes and thinks in those terms which we have been accustomed to associate with the Republican Party, it is supposed to be courteous to call him a Republican. When a gentleman speaks, thinks, and writes in the terms we have been accustomed to associate with the historic Democratic Party, it is supposed to be courteous to speak of the gentleman as a Democrat. When a gentleman speaks in terms that we have been accustomed to associate with socialism, it is proper to call the gentleman a Socialist. In each instance we speak in respect, because it is a political creed, a political theory we would designate. And when gentlemen speak, publish, write, and act in accordance with the doctrines of Lenin and Trotsky, and undertake to put into actual practice in America the code now being put into effect by Stalin from Moscow in Russia, why not "call a spade a spade" so that the American people may understand that the administration of the milk department under the A.A.A. is pure and simple Russia's communism. I offer this with great respect. I offer this not in abuse or cynicism. This is a means of intellectual differentiation between the original, the historic, the fundamental Americanism of those who have been here long enough to inherit the instinct of America, upon the one hand, and the doctrine that in the last 15 years has been put into effect in Russia where 180,000,000 people live, upon the other hand.

The statement which is the occasion of my remarks states:

To calls of "communism" from Capitol Hill against the administration's milk policy, the Farm Administration today answered "Red herrings."

I am drawing a red herring across the path to deceive you. What I want to do, above everything else in this world, is to convince that good man at the other end of the Avenue, whose heart is as white as a sheet of paper, whose mind is as pure as a saint's, whose resolution is to serve the whole American people, but who, in my opinion, does not know

the contents of Wallace's last book, does not know that Tugwell has made out of the milk division of the A.A.A. a pure instrumentality of communism, who does not know that the policy of Tugwell took Peek out of that administration, and that the policy he is compelling Davis and Frank and the others now to set in motion will wreck every milk shed in America.

My people at Houston and in my county, which is 80 miles square, are no more important than any other in this Nation, but I respectfully submit that no other milk shed and no other people and no other community in this Nation are any more important than my people.

I would do injury to no other section. I do not want any administration of the milk department to wreck the milk sheds where I dwell.

This statement says:

Chester C. Davis, Agricultural Adjustment Administrator, put it this way: "That the milk-control policy was aimed directly at better prices for farmers and less for milk companies." Then he added:

"That is the only issue involved."

May God pardon him for that false statement.

"It should not be confused by charges of communism, or any other red herrings of that sort."

The trouble came to a head when about 100 Members of Congress gathered Wednesday night for a mass attack on the milk plan. They adopted a resolution condemning it after hearing such charges as "communists", "theorists", and "dreamers" directed at farm administration heads.

The night meeting was the newest development of a movement under way for weeks, led by Representative JOE H. EAGLE, Democrat, Texas, to secure an altered policy.

Secretary Wallace recently announced results of an audit of distributors' books in four cities showing profits ranging from 14 to 30 percent by the firms examined.

Said Davis today:

"If Representative EAGLE believes we should go back to the former policy of supporting the milk companies' spreads and profits, he should say so.

"OPPOSE LOWERING PRICES

"It is not the policy of the administration to lower prices to producers in a single milk shed. Wherever farmers have felt that by their own efforts they could get prices higher than we felt we could enforce by law, we have urged them to make the undertaking on their own initiative.

"But if the Federal Government assumes responsibility for enforcement by law of a farm price for fluid milk, the Government must first establish that such a price is reasonably coordinated with local conditions."

This latter statement is not the truth. The only object of their policy now being worked out is to lower prices to the producers in every milk shed except those very few favored milk sheds that have overdeveloped the dairying industry, so as to put out of business the milk sheds in all your districts in order to make a market throughout the country for the State of Iowa and that section where Wallace comes from, because they have three times as much milk production there as they can consume; and such action will have the effect, even if it be not the actual purpose, to constitute the chain store as sole milk distributor.

Let me tell you the simple facts about my milk shed—and they fit your milk shed, every one of them. My only excuse for telling you about the milk-shed troubles in my district is that, with the varying exceptions of local conditions, it fits yours also.

Secretary Wallace appointed or had appointed Professor Tugwell as assistant. He appointed or had appointed Mr. Peek. Mr. Peek showed a 100-percent sense of understanding Americanism, and he made the milk-marketing agreements. They were right. For this reason Mr. Peek was "promoted" out of his position as soon as he set them up and was set out on the sidewalk.

What were the provisions of the marketing agreements Mr. Peek set up? They were, as required by the Agricultural Adjustment Act that you enacted here last year, that the parity price should be taken into consideration in fixing the maximum and minimum price of milk to producers in every milk shed in the land. What do you mean by "parity price"? You mean the general average of the cost of production in each milk shed, separately, in the United States for the years 1909 to 1914, inclusive.

These men now administering this milk department under the A.A.A. say they will not take into consideration the cost of production in any milk shed; that is, they defy the Congress of the United States and declare they will not mind the law, a provision of which I have just quoted.

It costs \$2.37 in my milk sheds around Houston to produce 100 pounds of milk. We have certain local conditions there. We are in a flat country. It is not good agricultural land. It does not drain well. We have not lived there long enough or been rich enough to fix drainage so as to make the grass good for dairying. My dairying constituents, therefore, have to get shell out of the sea and grind it up in order to put lime into our cattle. There is no iron in the grass, and therefore they have to give the herds feed that puts iron in them to make the milk perfect. They do not raise enough corn in our county to supply the dairying interest, and they buy that from the northern portion of our State. They do not raise a single bushel of wheat nor a single pound of alfalfa, and therefore they must import from northern Texas and from Kansas and Oklahoma and other States every bit of our dairy feed.

Twenty years ago 20 citizens of Houston lent \$5,000 each, total of \$100,000, through a banker to establish the milk industry in our county to supply what was then a little city of 70,000 people. It succeeded in firmly establishing the dairy industry there. They have repaid that \$100,000 in full, with interest, and have made an industry taxed at a valuation of \$3,000,000. Such as it is, it is satisfactory to our entire people, and I protest against its destruction by the discard of the Peek marketing-agreement plan and the substitution of the license system based for return to producer upon the current price of butter upon the Chicago Produce Exchange.

Since then Houston has come to be one of the three great ports of the United States, with 87 steamship companies coming to our door. Houston is now the chief cotton port of the United States. She has come to be the chief oil-producing, shipping, refining, and selling distribution point, not of Texas alone, nor of the South only, nor of the United States, but of the world.

The result is that 325,000 people are settled there, a beautiful community, and a source of pride and credit to all of you. They are a good people; they attend to their own local affairs, and it has contributed enormously to the general welfare throughout this Nation. Houston buys millions and tens of millions of dollars' worth of manufactured products of your local industries which are peculiarly fitted for making them. She buys food products from the congressional districts of most of you.

Our dairymen have another condition there. They have to fight the mosquito and the cattle tick attempting to eradicate them. Then consider the cost of labor, the rental of land, or the interest on the investment in land, the taxes, and it costs \$2.37 a hundredweight to produce absolutely pure Jersey milk which is inspected and reported upon under city, county, and State auspices.

The milk shed at Houston has only one grade of milk. We do not have grade A, grade B, and grade C, composed mostly of skimmed milk. The Jersey cow is acclimated and satisfactory to our people, and, as a result, a large part of every quart of milk is cream fit to be put on cereals. We are satisfied with it.

Last September I got the milk administration to send two of their force down there to verify our cost of \$2.37 a hundred, and they came and they verified.

At my own expense I went home to aid; and 600 producers, who paid back \$100,000 loaned them 20 years ago, had a plant in the county worth \$3,000,000 and assessed for it, dwelling in peace and harmony. All signed the Peek code, the market agreement which Mr. Peek prepared, and which took \$2.37 as a basis for producing 100 pounds of pure milk.

Then the agreement was signed by distributors and the creamery and dairy people to purchase the milk daily at agreed price, cleanse it, pasteurize it, put it in bottles, and deliver it in white-painted wagons to our doors by young

men who are friends of the consumer families, and it was stated in the papers that the price was to be 11 cents a quart. Our people have been divided on many public questions for years, but for once producer, distributor, and consumer agreed. That would give the cost plus and a little profit to the producer and cost plus and profit to the distributor.

(The time of Mr. EAGLE having expired, he was given 10 minutes more.)

Mr. EAGLE. That was last October. Mr. Peek was promoted out of his position, and others were put in their places. The lawyers of the milk administration all came from the city of New York.

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

Mr. EAGLE. No, I cannot; I thank the gentleman. I am not going to submit to seeing my people ruined if I can help it, I do not care if I ruin myself. [Applause.] That is the same way with the rest of you. That agreement has been here since last October. There are 559 actual members in my own county of the South Texas Producers Association, who do not know whether to charge 8 cents or 14 cents or what, who are in endless confusion, and who are in the same fix that your producers are in—the dumping of milk, anything to break it up and put it into ruin, instead of each milk shed being allowed, as we said in our bill, to get the parity price and find out the cost of production, to take an agreed profit by the consent of this administration of milk here, find the cost of distribution, and see whether the consuming public agrees, and for each to sign the code accordingly. That is Americanism, that is what Mr. Peek agreed to, that is what they sent down that marketing agreement to Houston to have done only. Our producers and distributors signed it, and the consumers universally acquiesced. Since last October this A.A.A. milk administration has done nothing. Instead of that, they say now that they will not consider the cost of production in any milk shed. They say they will take the price of butter on the Chicago Commodity Exchange as the basis on which to take a lead pencil and a piece of paper and do mysterious monkey-business figuring and say how much your people are allowed to charge in Utica, N.Y., in Houston, Tex., in Hartford, Conn., in Los Angeles, Calif., in St. Louis, Mo., and in every other milk shed, which means the center to which all of the milk flows for pasteurizing and distribution, and fix the price of milk on that, instead, as our law said, on the parity price, which meant the cost during the years 1909 to 1914. Figured on that, the price of butter in Chicago, the price of liquid milk in my county, will be \$1.87 per 100 pounds. That is 50 cents less than my people can produce it. That means that a local industry that we have been 30 years in making goes out of business.

They propose to issue a license to every man that milks a cow and puts the milk into a can and sends it by his truck to market—give him a license so that he can sell his milk for a maximum of \$1.87, when it costs him \$2.37 in my milk shed to produce it. The maximum price in every milk shed, figures for which we had available at our caucus, is reduced below the cost of present production and below the corresponding cost of the parity period. Now, that is an unholy thing to do. That is what Lenin would have done; that is what Stalin may properly do in Moscow; that is how Stalin liquidated the Kulak. He put him out of business. That is on the theory that you can move a million families in America, whether they want to be moved or not, by a bureaucrat saying we want to have you move out of West Virginia into Texas or Iowa.

My friends, I do not want the skim milk from the Holstein cow excess in the State of Iowa to be sent down to feed the babies in my town of Houston. Let us alone. We have asked nothing of the milk administration except to let our producers, our distributors, our consuming public agree, as they did unanimously, the three classes; and when they do agree, and agreed that 11 cents a quart was the right price, sign up the code, and there is no milk question in my district and there will be no milk question in your district under those conditions. The price of butter on the Chicago

market varies every day. Even if it were an invariable quantity and you undertook to fix the price of fluid milk at Atlanta, Ga., or Hartford, Conn., or elsewhere, on what the gambling price of butter is in Chicago this week, what in the world have the people who produced the milk for a milk shed got to do with that? They cannot produce and live unless they get the cost, and they cannot produce and get cost unless they get distribution, and they cannot get distribution unless each man is himself a pasteurizer. He cannot do that. He chooses his distributor. The distributor spends hundreds of thousands of dollars putting up a beautiful plant, and has hundreds of white painted wagons that distribute to the door; and if the producer is satisfied and the distributor is satisfied and the consuming public is satisfied, why break that up in order to make a market for surplus products in over-dairyized sections of the country?

Whenever you wreck the producer in your neighborhood by not letting them have the cost of production based on local conditions, you put the distributor out of business. When you put the choice of a community, the distributor, on one side and the consuming public on the other, and when you take away from them their choice of a distributing agent that is universally satisfactory, there is but one other thing that is inevitable, and that is that the chain store becomes the distributor of milk in every town and city in this land. I have no objection to the chain store, but I do not want to have my wife compelled to walk to a chain store to buy a bottle of milk, where they can sell a thousand other articles and sell milk at a cent a quart cheaper than the boy who distributes it, because the chain store makes up such loss by selling to that customer other articles as well. I want the milk brought to my door, and so do you.

I love to go a long way in trying to get out of this depression. As a lawyer it is sometimes a hard thing to do, but I find consolation in working in harmony every time I can, and that has been every time in 14 months, except on one vote.

On my father's side my ancestor was at Bunker Hill. On my mother's side my great-grandfather was with George Washington at Yorktown. My grandfather was at New Orleans with Old Hickory. Their simple hearts rejoiced in the Declaration of Independence. Their simple minds rejoiced in the Constitution of the United States, and they knew what individual liberty and local self-government and State sovereignty meant then, and their unworthy descendant knows what it means now. I will not stand still and permit the wreckage of my free, independent, upright people by this method under Tugwell and Frank and the other five lawyers out of the city of New York, without protest. Maybe when they have lived in America a few generations, they, too, will feel the fundamental thrilling impulse of Americanism.

Mr. REED of New York. I am sorry to interrupt the gentleman. He is making a wonderful presentation of this subject. The gentleman was emphasizing the cost of production, and he stated that his milk producers buy so much feed outside. Has the gentleman mentioned the fact that the price of that feed has practically doubled?

Mr. EAGLE. That is an interesting point. The price of the feed that we buy to feed our dairy cattle has practically doubled. I only wish I had more ability and more time in which to develop this theme. I beg you all to join me in this earnest effort to prevent the wreck of a \$6,000,000,000 industry.

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

Mr. SINCLAIR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LUNDEEN].

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. Chairman, in this brief time I would like to call the attention of Members to the bonus battle recently fought out in the great State of Pennsylvania. I see Distinguished Members of the Pennsylvania delegation present, and, if I am wrong, they can correct me.

VETERANS TALK TO THEIR ENEMIES WITH VOTES

On November 7, 1933, the citizens of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania voted almost 2 to 1 in favor of a State constitutional amendment to permit the legislature to pass a \$50,000,000 bonus law. The vote was 964,708 for to 580,-

794 against, a majority of 383,914. On November 15, 1933, the house and senate of Pennsylvania, without one dissenting vote, passed the Pennsylvania bonus law, appropriating about \$50,000,000 to pay veterans of the Spanish-American War and the World War. Within the next 60 days millions of dollars will be distributed to the veterans of Pennsylvania. The money will be immediately spent. The small business man, the landlord, the butcher, and the baker know that payment of the bonus will benefit them.

SOLDIER BOYS HUMBLE THE RICH

Some of the richest people in this country live in Pennsylvania. Powerful, wealthy interests are there. The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania has been one of the strongholds of big business. But, in spite of that, and in spite of the fact that the entire country is passing through the greatest panic in its history, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania found \$50,000,000 for the veterans of that State. The overwhelming success of the Pennsylvania veterans is an indication of the power of the united veterans of America. Members of this House will be interested in knowing the secret back of the veterans' overwhelming victory in that great State. The Veterans of Foreign Wars, Department of Pennsylvania, have kindly given me some election and campaign information.

VETERANS SHOW STRONG UNITED FRONT

In May 1933 a campaign was started to bring about the adoption of an amendment by the electorate of Pennsylvania which would enable the State legislature to pass a bonus law. The election was to take place on November 7, 1933. The Veterans of Foreign Wars, Department of Pennsylvania, circularized every post, made public addresses, obtained newspaper publicity. At least a million bonus cards were distributed. Pitted against the veterans were the National Economy League, the State chamber of commerce, and the American Veterans' Association. The paid newspaper propaganda put on by these organizations to save the pocketbooks of the super-rich spurred the veterans on, and they decided to give the infamous Economy League a real battle. The more money the chamber of commerce spent, the more determined the veterans became. They went among their friends—the common people; they talked to the small businessmen and explained the benefits to be derived from the distribution of \$50,000,000. They instructed every veteran to take his mother, father, sister, brother, wife, and friends to the polls. They asked every member of the post or auxiliary to take at least three or four friends and relatives to the polls. Nearly all of Pennsylvania's 400,000 veterans went on the firing line at once. Victory was inevitable.

THE POWER OF THE UNITED VETERANS OF AMERICA

On election day every district commander, deputy chief of staff, and post commander appointed a committee whose duty it was to see that every polling place in the vicinity of the post was covered by a member of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. The members stood as close to the polling places as possible, passing out cards, specimen ballots, and other literature urging the voter to support amendment no. 4. Voters were personally contacted, in the cities and throughout the rural districts.

SO-CALLED "VETERANS' ORGANIZATION" COMES TO GRIEF

The American Veterans' Association attempted to fly autogiro planes to which were attached streamers urging people to vote against the bonus amendment. This organization was known as the "antibonus veteran organization." Wide publicity was given this organization by the big business controlled press. But when the autogiro group attempted to take off at Harrisburg, where chamber of commerce officials met to give them a send-off, they found several hundred infuriated veterans who prevented the planes from taking off. This dramatic incident impressed upon the minds of the voters the fact that the veterans' reception committee was made up of poor men, whereas the autogiro group was composed of wealthy individuals who were trying to escape their just burden of veterans' relief by the use of publicity stunts. The autogiro group then realized that the use of planes to fight against the cause of the veterans was a mistake. In the words of Adj. C. A.

Gnau, of the Pennsylvania department, Veterans of Foreign Wars, "They 'folded up' and sneaked back to Philadelphia."

VETERANS USE THEIR POLITICAL POWER

The Veterans of Foreign Wars, the American Legion, the Disabled American Veterans, the United Spanish War Veterans, and other groups cooperated in these different activities which finally tore down all opposition and dealt big business in Pennsylvania one of the most crushing defeats in its history. Not a single dissenting vote was cast against the 1933 bonus bill in the legislature of Pennsylvania.

What the veterans of Pennsylvania did can be done by the veterans of America. It is only a matter of time. Editorials are being published in the great papers of the country demanding payment of the bonus now. I am also informed that Father Charles E. Coughlin yesterday spoke to the Nation, urging immediate payment of the adjusted-service certificates. He called for a million volunteers to stand by the veterans in this fight. With civic and commercial organizations, large newspapers, and radio stations thundering against soldier legislation, with imported organizations against them, the 400,000 veterans of Pennsylvania marched to the polls and won a smashing victory, and taught the veterans of America to use their political power.

IMMEDIATE PAYMENT IN NONINTEREST-BEARING UNITED STATES NOTES

H.R. 1, the Patman bill, provides for immediate payment of adjusted-service certificates in non-interest-bearing United States notes, issued by the Secretary of the Treasury. Two billion dollars, issued in this form, and scattered throughout the country, will alleviate the poverty and destitution which the vicious, cruel, and inhuman Economy Act brought upon the veterans of America. It will enable millions of people to pay the doctor, the dentist, the grocer, the butcher, and the baker. It will stimulate all forms of local trade. Local merchants realize this. It will lift the burden of veterans' relief which the Economy Act has thrown upon State and local governments. The unanimous passage of the Pennsylvania bonus law points the way for the Congress of the United States. On April 27, 1933, I signed the Lundeen petition, my signature being no. 1, to bring H.R. 1, the Patman bill, out of the Ways and Means Committee so that we might have a vote on the bill in the House. For 10 long months I struggled to reach 145 names on that petition, the required number. Finally, on February 20, the author of the bill, Mr. PATMAN, signed the petition, being no. 128 on that petition. Other Democratic leaders joined him and the grand rush for the desk to sign began. In spite of big business, in defiance of the highest officials in the land, Members of the great House of Representatives finally determined on a roll-call vote on March 12, 1934.

WHEN VETERANS UNITE, VICTORY IS SURE

The veterans of America know their power. The victory of their comrades in Pennsylvania adds another milestone to the political victories of the Grand Army. In 50 years after the Civil War they lost one Presidential fight. During that time every President was a member of the G.A.R. When veterans unite, victory is sure.

Mr. SINCLAIR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McFADDEN].

Mr. McFADDEN. Mr. Chairman, this Congress is in between wars. We are dividing our time between appropriating for the next war and discussing why we did not receive payment on the loans we made for the last one.

A deliberate and sustained effort is being made to promote us into a war with Japan. I do not think that the people of Japan want such a war. I am sure that the people of the United States do not. In neither country will the people have anything to say about the outcome of the present effort.

Peoples seldom have anything to say about wars—or about any other decision made in the determination of what is so oddly called "public policy."

The advertised possibilities of war between the United States and Japan are a sequel to the World War of 1914–1918. Enmity is being deliberately provoked between the two nations, and provoked for the benefit of neither the

United States nor Japan. It is just another move on the international chessboard.

The story runs back for centuries. To take it no further back than the independent life of our own country, our revolt against English absentee government in 1776 coincided with an eagerness upon the part of France to win an advantage over England. Our success in the capture of Burgoyne's army at Saratoga made French intervention in our behalf look like a good political investment to the French King and court. French intervention at that critical period in our history played a part in inflicting upon England the greatest disaster she ever suffered—the loss of that portion of her American Colonies which now compose the United States.

England waited only a short time to redress the scale. The rise of France under Napoleon constituted a threat to the institution of monarchy and its foundation, that other institution of poverty, which rallied together the powerful conservatism of Europe against the Corsican. England financed and led the once discordant elements which joined forces against Napoleon.

It was English money and political leadership which overthrew Napoleon. It was England which seized French colonies and trade routes and converted them to the benefit of English commerce. Victory in the Napoleonic wars was the foundation of England's industrial and commercial prosperity, including her practical monopoly in the carriage of the world's ocean trade.

The next threat to England's grasp upon the implements of national wealth was the rapid rise of the American merchant marine in the first half of the last century. The clipper ships from Chesapeake and New England yards almost drove the slower English merchantman from the seas. The result was England's promotion and financing of the South in the Civil War. England's participation in that struggle was not by force of arms. She made unofficial loans to the Confederate States, which she still talks of collecting, built and equipped southern cruisers to prey upon northern commerce, and made huge profits by running into the beleaguered South from Nassau, in the Bahamas, cargoes of merchandise, so badly needed in the Confederacy that price was no barrier.

The Civil War was a victory for England. The threatening American merchant marine was driven from the seas; the mind of the United States was turned away from foreign trade and inward upon the settlement of internal problems, and England once more was mistress of the sea-borne commerce of the world. She filled none of the million graves of our exhausting conflict. She bore none of the scars which the gallant South bears even to this day.

The next threat to England was the rise of Russia to world power. The Russian is, in the main, a native of a cold climate. Like all natives of the colder zones, he feels an urge toward the equator. It was that urge which brought from the cold forests of northern Europe to the warm lands of the Mediterranean hordes of invaders to overthrow the Roman Empire. Russia yearned for ice-free ports on the Mediterranean and the Pacific. Her first effort to take Constantinople was hindered by Turkish arms at Plevna, halted by the British fleet at San Stefano, and defeated by British diplomacy in the Treaty of Berlin.

Defeated in Europe, Russia turned to Asia. She built the trans-Siberian railroad to Vladivostok, but the distance was too great to make that route economically useful. She turned south halfway to the Pacific and set her eyes on the Khyber Pass, gateway to the thronging millions of India and the warm waters of the Persian Gulf and the Indian Ocean. England faced that threat for only a decade before she made alliance with the rising power of Japan and supported the latter Nation in the terrible war against Russia in 1904 and 1905. Russia's navy was destroyed, her army was beaten overwhelmingly, and her prestige in Asia was wrecked by the humiliation of defeat. India was safe for another generation. It had been saved, not by British arms but by British statecraft and British money—and Japanese blood.

The next menace to be dealt with was the rising world power of the German Empire, whose grave is another mile-

stone in the path of English trade supremacy. England sought first to fight through the arms of allies, restricting her own contribution to her navy, her money, and an army of moderate size. The task was too great to be handled with anything less than all that England had. She came to a pass in the conflict where the battlefields of France called for more soldiers than she could give without reducing her own home defenses.

It is not generally known that at the time that her allies, including the United States, were fighting with their backs to the wall in France, England held within her own country a reserve army which she never let fall below 2,000,000 men. That force was for her own salvation and never was offered for the aid of her hard-pressed allies.

Americans remember all too well the battle of propaganda fought between England and Germany for the support of the United States. England won that battle and in winning it won the war. She needed help. She needed our men so that she might keep her own at home. She needed our money for war so that she might keep her own for commerce.

England's trade suffered huge losses during the World War. Markets once supplied from London and Liverpool and Manchester turned to New York and Pittsburgh and Chicago—to Osaka and Kobe to Yokohama. Freight and passengers once carried under the Union Jack sought carriage under the Stars and Stripes—or the flag of the Rising Sun. It was the first war in which England lost trade.

The end found England weakened and sore. Her fleet had suffered attrition in the 4 years of conflict and the sinking of the German fleet at Scapa Flow denied England the reinforcement she had hoped to make from among the captured ships. The Congress of the United States had initiated and was bringing to a conclusion the building of what would be incomparably the strongest navy in the world. England was in second place on the sea—a position she had not been forced to take for centuries.

The answer to that problem was found by British diplomacy in the Washington Conference for the Limitation of Naval Armaments. In that strange affair the United States destroyed its new fleet and surrendered its primacy on the seas in the most remarkable gathering ever held in this Nation. It was sure of success from the first. America was given a chance to be big-hearted—and when have we ever had the strength of mind to resist such a blandishment?

With all information to American newspapers concerning the Conference given out through a press bureau established by the British foreign office in Washington for that purpose, our people acquiesced in England's greatest naval victory. As a result of the Conference, the United States sank more of its own warship tonnage than was lost by all England's enemies in all the sea battles since England became a sea power.

Today England faces new menaces to her world primacy. Japan has become an industrial nation. Superimposing ancient peasant wages upon a splendid modern equipment for machine production and ocean transport, she has won a sudden success in the markets of the world on a basis of price alone. Japanese cotton goods can be laid down beside Lancashire and Yorkshire mills, with freight and duty paid, at a price far below the bare cost of production in England. That one example may be multiplied a hundred times to make the complete picture of economic disaster which clouds the horizon of England's recovery.

England's command of the sea is menaced in the Atlantic by the parity of the United States Fleet and overwhelmed in Asiatic waters by the naval power of Japan. England's command of the sea is her only hold upon continued existence as a world power. Not the narrow lands of Britain, but the wide reaches of the seven seas are England's empire. English keels plow and till the sea and bring the crop up the Thames to London Town.

I am not denouncing England nor am I charging her with greed. I am but pointing out the unchanging policy of intelligent selfishness which has built and maintained for centuries the longest lived of history's empires. That intelligent selfishness is not a vice, but a virtue—and a virtue we would do well to study and emulate. We should do

better by ourselves than we have done. We should do by ourselves at least as well as we have done by others. Of course, we have been "sold" on the idea that it is our divinely appointed function to be the world's permanent Santa Claus. That sale to the American mind has been a good sale for those who made it and was worth many times the selling cost.

England's intelligent selfishness—which is nothing more nor less than the sense of self-preservation—sees a new peril facing her. She would offend her own history if she did not now play the old game that she has won so many times in the past. Here stand two rivals for English supremacy in world trade—the United States and Japan. Here stand two rivals for the naval command of the sea which is the cornerstone upon which rests Britain's commercial empire—the United States and Japan.

If fate, with a little assistance from propaganda, should rule that these two rivals of wise old England should destroy each other's naval and commercial strength by conflict with each other, England would stand to recover the trade and ocean carriage she has lost. Would it be any wonder if she should look with at least tolerance upon the prospect of a conflict which would serve to strengthen her by weakening, in England, the facts that she is bound to the United States by ties of blood and to Japan by ties of alliance?

Let there be no mistake concerning the foundation of England's greatness and power. England has never made a move or fought a war or made an alliance or offered the hand of friendship or the fist of enmity that she was not guided by definite plans for the commercial advantage of her people. Command of the sea means but one thing to England—and that thing is ocean trade. Battleships are the window dressing of empire. Liners and tramp steamers are its reality. England is wise, and England is wise because it has learned that very simple truth past any unlearning.

The long struggle which began when William the Norman defeated and killed Harold the Saxon at Hastings in 1066 is over now. England has won her 10-century war with France. France, too, is wise. She has accepted the verdict of history. She has quitclaimed her title to the seas to England. That she may hold her primacy on the land, she has made common cause with her ancient enemy across the narrow seas that roll between Dover and Calais.

Together, England and France were not strong enough to defeat Germany. They needed our help and they won what they needed. The victory gained, it was time to count the cost. Counting the cost meant paying the bills—and there France and England erred. Both are nations which depend upon foreign trade for their prosperity. Foreign trade means foreign credit—and foreign credit means foreign collections. It was not wise for England and France to set before their debtors the example of repudiation. I am told that the real leadership of both countries now realize that the mistake they made when they defaulted on their debts to us may in the end cost them more than they stand to gain. Both Nations might now welcome a way out of their error that would save their faces—a way in which they could seem generous, a way in which they would not be forced to admit their error, a way in which they could reestablish their good names without ever admitting that their repute had been in question. I am here to suggest such a way out of the debt situation which is now so sore a spot upon the conscience of the world.

When we sat with the other victors of 1918 around that council table at Versailles, the Santa Claus robe was wrapped around the minds of our delegates. We asked nothing, we took nothing—and no one sought to force anything upon us.

When we entered the World War, our sovereignty in our own waters was unchallenged. Our coasts, we thought, were our own. Our one overseas possession, the Philippine Archipelago, was connected to our home shores by an unbroken line of communication—a sea highway of stepping stones called Hawaii, Wake Island, Midway Island, and Guam. True, there were scattered German islands athwart that route—the Carolines, the Marshall Islands, and part of the Ladrões, but there was no menace there. Germany was a long way from those drowsy outposts of empire and

her ownership of those dots in the Pacific served her pride without injuring our communications.

At Versailles those islands were given to Japan to administer under a mandate of the League of Nations. What has Japan done with the islands she holds under that mandate? It is time that this body and America as a whole should know the answer to that question—not to fan the flame of war but rather to prevent those flames from being lighted.

I will tell you what Japan has done. She has transformed her Bonin Islands into one of the strongest naval bases in the world. These islands lie 500 miles from the Japanese coast on the direct line to Guam. On one of her mandated islands, less than an hour's flight from Guam she has built a "commercial" airport. Commercial? What commerce of the air is there in that waste spot of the Pacific? Let us accept this description of that airport as "commercial" and say only that war planes can land at "commercial" airports and take off from "commercial" airports and that the tanks which pump fuel to commercial planes can pump the same fuel to war planes and that storehouses for the wares of commerce can also hold bombs and ammunition for machine guns. All of these things can be done less than an hour from our island of Guam, which is undefended because of the nine-power treaty into which we entered at the Washington Conference. Nothing was said in that treaty about "commercial" airports. When will we ever learn anything about signing treaties?

To the south of Guam lie the Caroline Islands, to the east and southeast lie the Marshall group. Is it any news to you, Mr. Speaker, that those supposed peaceful isles are closed to American ships, that for a stretch of close to 2,000 miles of the Pacific there are scores of islands and thousands of square miles of sea in which American ships are forbidden to travel, which American citizens are forbidden to visit? That is the truth, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GOSS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McFADDEN. I yield.

Mr. GOSS. Will the gentleman tell us in what way American ships are prohibited from intercourse with those islands?

Mr. McFADDEN. They are not permitted to enter the ports.

Mr. GOSS. By some law or regulation of the Japanese Government?

Mr. McFADDEN. Under mandate at the Treaty of Versailles those islands were given to Japan, and Japan now controls them, and she does not permit any Americans, in any kind of a ship, to enter them.

I do not know what is going on behind that screen of secrecy; neither does the Intelligence Department of our Navy. All that any American knows is that there is a hole in the map there. No; we know a little more than that: We know that in the Marshall Islands alone there are at least 10 splendid large ship havens of the size which naval men describe as "fleet harbors." We know that those fleet harbors are closer to our Territory of Hawaii than is our own Pacific coast. We know that behind that screen of secrecy the Japanese battle fleet may at any hour lie with steam up, a day's journey closer to Hawaii than our own fleet could be at its base at San Diego. Our line of communication to Asia and the Philippines is cut, Mr. Speaker. Hawaii is outflanked.

That is not a line of political communication. The perfection of Philippine independence will not by one penny cheapen the value of our line of communication to the Orient. That is a commercial and not a political line of communication. In the days before this depression our sea-borne commerce with the Orient amounted to a total of \$2,000,000,000 a year. It may reach that total again, when happier days return, but not if it must ply its way through hostile seas and go out of its way to avoid forbidden areas of water.

For our foreign trade with the Orient it is imperative that we should have defensible stepping stones across the Pacific—first, for anchorage and repairs and supply of our

merchant marine; second, for our warships to protect that merchant marine.

Our old route via Guam is useless now. We must have a new route. That route we can have if our allies have not forgotten the marines at Chateau Thierry, the charging lines of American divisions that misty July morning south of Soissons, the Yankee armies that struck at St. Mihiel, and in the Argonne those hammer blows that broke the German line of communication with the fatherland and forced the evacuation of France and Belgium. It is France which has the opportunity to aid us in establishing the first stepping stone of our new route to Asia.

In 1813, the United States frigate *Essex* rounded Cape Horn to attack British commerce in the South Pacific. Thousands of miles from her home base, battered, strained, and leaking, Commodore Porter sought a place to repair his ship. With only scanty charts, he found the island of Nukahiva in the Marquesas, where he established the first naval base in foreign waters ever owned by the United States Government. After defeating 20,000 Typee warriors, he made a treaty of annexation with the natives, which treaty failed of confirmation by the United States Senate. In 1842, the Marquesas Islands were annexed by France. The story of the islands since then has been a sad one. The swarming population of Porter's day, so great that a single tribe on a single island mustered 20,000 fighting men, has shrunk to a total of barely 2,000 persons for the whole group. There is no commerce, and France gains no revenue or tactical advantage from the possession of these islands. There is almost no white population, and few ties bind Nukahiva to Paris. There is, however, a splendid deep-water harbor of good size, a rich and fertile interior, and a healthful climate. Elevations range from sea level to 4,000 feet, and the islands can produce sufficient food to be entirely self-supporting in event of blockade. They are easily defended, and I am told that the Navy would like to have them for a naval base as well as a supply and repair port for American merchant ships.

The Marquesas are situated 3,950 miles southeast of the Pacific entrance to the Panama Canal and somewhat less than half that distance from Hawaii and Samoa, our present nearest ports in the Pacific. Hawaii is 4,700 miles from the Canal, which gives the Marquesas a distinct advantage in accessibility.

I suggest that France and the United States agree upon a transfer of the Marquesas Islands to the United States in consideration of a cancelation of France's delinquent payments to this country under the debt agreement.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McFADDEN. I yield.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Would it not be well also to acquire the French West Indies that bar our way to the Panama Canal?

Mr. McFADDEN. I will say that I have already made that suggestion, and I will repeat it today.

The next stepping stone in the new route would have to come to us through negotiation with England. Thirty-five hundred miles west of the Marquesas lie the Solomon Islands, partly a British possession and partly an Australian mandate. The islands in the Australian mandate were seized from Germany in 1915. The British portion were annexed in 1895 and, as recently as 1927, native outbreaks forced the establishment of martial law. No strong ties bind the islands either to England or to Australia. There are among these islands many excellent harbors which are desirable sites for naval bases and commercial dockyards.

Even more desirable are the Admiralty Islands, former German possessions now held by Australia under a mandate of the League of Nations. They are immediately northwest of the Solomons and about two thousand or twenty-five hundred miles from Mindanao in the Philippines.

I suggest that England and Australia arrange to transfer the Admiralty Islands or the Solomons to the United States in consideration of cancelation of payments now delinquent on Britain's obligation to the United States.

Transfer of remote island territory from one nation to another is nothing new in history. England and France have

both made many such transfers in the very recent past and have discussed other such transfers within the last few years.

Some years ago Ramsay MacDonald, Premier of England, made a historic visit to the United States, during which he engaged in a famous secret conversation with the then President Herbert Hoover while both were sitting upon a log at the Rapidan Camp. The subject of that conversation has been one of our historic mysteries ever since. There have been many surmises and speculations as to what was said, but the veil of silence has remained unlifted until today. I have been told the subject of that conversation and I believe that the time has come to make it public. I shall now do so.

The subject of the conversation was the arranging of some adjustment of the British debt to the United States that should relieve Britain of at least a part of the cash outlay involved. I am told that Mr. MacDonald offered to transfer the Bermuda Islands to the United States in part payment of the British debt and that after some consideration Mr. Hoover declined the offer. I have been told the alleged reason for Mr. Hoover's declination, but I feel that he should have the opportunity to state that reason himself if he wishes to do so.

I am also informed that the title of the British Government to the Bermudas is about to be questioned in British courts and that the case of the Crown is not a strong one.

The offer of Mr. MacDonald to make such a trade discredits statements made by the Premiers of France and England some years ago when I suggested publicly that the British and French West Indies be accepted as part payment on the debts of both countries. At that time, Paris and London put forward the argument that they could not trade off their citizens. I did not think that objection in good faith then and I am confirmed in that belief by what I have been told about Mr. MacDonald's Bermuda offer.

There is no ground for any such objection in the case of the Marquesas, which were our territory before they were annexed by France. No ground for any such objection exists in the case of either the Admiralty or the Solomon Islands. In the establishment of a United States naval base close to Australia, there could be no possible menace to Australia or England, who hold far stronger bases in the immediate vicinity. I should think that the advocates of a white Australia would feel additional safety in the presence of a strong United States position between Australia and Asia.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McFADDEN] has expired.

Mr. THURSTON. I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes, but I should like to interrogate the gentleman. We are all much interested in his statement concerning the strategic points in the South Pacific, but in view of the pronounced hostility of both Russia and China against the ambitions of Japan, is not that situation a compensating one that will absorb any liability that we may have in that region?

Mr. McFADDEN. We have never raised any objection to the acquisition of territory by Japan in the Pacific, and I can see no reason why Japan should raise any question of our protecting our interests by this acquisition and trade with those countries. On the contrary, I think it would be a wholesome thing, looking toward future peace.

The United States has no ambitions for conquest. It desires only to protect what it has. It may be said that under the Nine Power Treaty we have no right to fortify naval bases in the Pacific. We have no such right. The nine-power treaty expires next year. Present indications are that it will not be renewed. Japan, one of the principal signatories, seems bent upon creating in the Pacific a condition which would be best described as one-power treaty. She is prepared to fortify her mandated islands and has already, as I have disclosed, taken steps to do so. I believe that the United States should prepare itself for the future by securing sites for naval bases to be built when we are ready to build them.

Naval bases and not ships are what determine the effective strength of a navy. We are now compelled to build ships

with unusually large fuel capacity because our cruisers must steam such vast distances between bases—a condition which hampers their usefulness and would greatly reduce their fighting power in event of hostilities.

Every nation in the world except this one is looking forward to conflict. Maybe they know what their own future actions will bring to pass. We did not start the last war but it involved us before it ended and we have not yet escaped from its consequences.

Every man who stops a Member of this House on the street and asks for the price of a cup of coffee is unconsciously seeking to collect a portion of the unpaid Allied debt. If that debt had been paid, as agreed, our financial emergency would be far less extensive than it now is.

Let us take a step to restore international credit by swapping liabilities. These islands are liabilities to France and England. They would be assets for us. The reputation of default is a liability to England and France. Our receipt for payments, now in default, would restore the credit of both those countries. Everybody in all three countries involved would feel better and maybe we could all go on to a better future from that point and in that spirit. [Applause.]

Mr. SINCLAIR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

WILLIAM W. BRIDE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to talk about the issuance of currency to take up Government obligations, but before I do that, I want to say a few words about the Corporation Counsel of the District of Columbia, Hon. William W. Bride. It happens that I am a member of the Legislative Committee on the District of Columbia, and I know something about the application for reappointment or continuance in office. If that is a nonpolitical office I see no reason why Mr. Bride's application should not be given consideration, but if it is an office that a Democrat should hold, certainly Mr. Bride should not ask for it. He should not ask for consideration as a Democrat and the District Commissioners should not consider his application if he does ask for reappointment or continuance in that office. It happens that up until 1927 everything Mr. Bride says about his politics is true. I think he had a good Democratic record; but I think he changed in 1927 and I think since that time he has been a loyal Republican. Nineteen hundred and twenty-eight was the year of the campaign between Mr. Hoover and Mr. Smith.

As my colleague from Texas suggested the other day, I notice in the RECORD that Mr. Bride made a gift of \$100 to the campaign fund of Herbert Hoover. That was on October 16, 1928. My colleague also suggested that Mr. Bride gave \$1,000 to the Democrats, but I do not think that will quite click. I do not think he gave \$1,000 to the Democrats; but I think he did make an investment in a newspaper that he lost later on and probably charged up to the Democratic Party. He did not make it as a contribution, if I understand the facts; and I got the impression from Mr. Bride himself.

On October 16, 1928, Mr. Bride made this contribution to the Republican campaign fund. The next year, in writing his autobiography for Who's Who, he deliberately listed himself as a Republican.

That is the only way you can construe it, because the organization that publishes Who's Who does not put anything in that book unless the author approves it. In that autobiography Mr. Bride records himself as a Republican. He records himself in that same publication for the years 1930, 1931, 1932, and 1933 as a Republican. In addition to contributing to the Republican campaign fund in 1928, he records himself as Republican for 1930, for 1931, for 1932, and for 1933; and my information is that Mr. Bride helped organize the National Young Republican organization here in the District of Columbia. Mr. Bride has had many opportunities to deny his contribution to the Republican Party in 1928, his mention in Who's Who for the years 1930, 1931, 1932, and 1933 as a Republican, and his assistance in establishing a Republican official organ here in the District of Columbia, but he has never denied these alleged facts.

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

Mr. PATMAN. After I complete my statement I will yield.

Mr. BLANTON. But I wish to answer this seriatim.

Mr. PATMAN. If the gentleman speaks for Mr. Bride, I shall be glad to yield to him.

Mr. BLANTON. I am speaking for justice to everyone. I am speaking for my colleague from Texarkana [Mr. PATMAN], who is such a good fisherman that I would like to see him fishing for minnows in waters where he could catch big fish.

Mr. PATMAN. I did not yield for a speech.

Mr. BLANTON. If the gentleman is going to level his guns at Republicans in our Democratic organization, I would like to see him let the little minnows alone and make his casts for whales such as Mr. Secretary Ickes and Mr. Secretary Henry Wallace, and Gen. Hugh S. Johnson, and Mr. Harry L. Hopkins, who have many years' affiliation with Republicans.

Mr. PATMAN. I know the gentleman's tactics is to distract attention from the issue; but I refuse to have my attention distracted. I am now talking about William W. Bride.

Mr. BLANTON. And I want to answer the gentleman particularly about Mr. William W. Bride, for I checked up on him myself.

Mr. PATMAN. Is it not a fact that he listed himself in Who's Who as a Republican?

Mr. BLANTON. No; he did not. I checked up on that. He was not even here when that went from his office.

Mr. PATMAN. Well, 4 years he is so listed.

Mr. BLANTON. Holding a job when a Republican was in the White House caused that reference to be printed. It was likely sent to Who's Who by a secretary.

Mr. PATMAN. I did not yield for a speech. I hope the gentleman will not take up all my time. Mr. Bride is trying to shift the blame, as he always does, this time to his secretary. It is strange that his secretary would list him as a Republican if he was Democrat, and, if he was so listed, it occurs to me that Bride should have changed it in the next edition of Who's Who.

Mr. BLANTON. Every postmaster in the gentleman's district and in my district under Republican regime has been assessed by the Republican Party, so much per annum out of their salaries. Every postmaster was assessed whether he was Democrat or Republican, and had to pay 10 percent of his salary into Republican coffers. The Republican Party believed in the assessment system for raising part of its campaign funds.

Mr. PATMAN. I hope the gentleman will not take too much of my time.

Mr. BLANTON. They compelled their postmasters holding office to contribute under the Republican administration.

Mr. PATMAN. They must have held the same gun to his head 4 years because of the fact he says during these 4 years that he was a Republican; and they must have had a great big gun held to his head when he helped organize this young Republican group in the District of Columbia.

Mr. BLANTON. If the gentleman will show me one single document that is signed by William W. Bride, and the gentleman and I both know his signature, in which he claims to be a Republican, I will no longer defend him as a Democrat. Does the gentleman criticize any of his official actions?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes; I do. The gentleman has asked me a frank question and I give him a frank answer.

Mr. BLANTON. Can the gentleman point to one single official act of his that warrants criticism?

Mr. PATMAN. I certainly can; and that is worthy of condemnation, too.

Mr. BLANTON. Please name one such act. I have not been able to find it.

Mr. PATMAN. I can name many such acts if the District Commissioners desire the information. The gentleman from Texas probably has not looked into his record but I have; and I know that he has listed himself as a Republican. He was so listed 4 years—1930, 1931, 1932, and 1933. That same Republican gun that was aimed at his head to make him give up \$100 during the campaign must have continued

to be aimed at him 4 more years, because he continued to aline himself as a Republican during that time.

Mr. BLANTON. Well, in this administration, is that an unforgivable sin? What about Mr. Secretary Henry A. Wallace; what about Mr. Secretary Harold L. Ickes?

Mr. PATMAN. Just a minute; I did not yield for a speech.

Mr. BLANTON. What about Gen. Hugh S. Johnson? Have these men ever alined themselves as Republicans?

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman does not want to talk about Mr. Bride, but he is the one about whom I am talking. These other gentlemen loyally supported President Roosevelt in 1932. Bride did not.

Mr. BLANTON. I would like to see the gentleman level his guns at the big fellows, not the little fellows.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman, Mr. Bride, was laying his course so that if a Republican were elected President, he would be able to present a perfect record. What better record could he have with the Republicans than to point to the fact that in 1928 he contributed to the campaign fund and that he was listed in Who's Who for 1930, 1931, 1932, and 1933 as a Republican? "Not only that, but I helped to organize the Young Republican Club in the District of Columbia", he would say. What better evidence of loyalty to the Republican Party could he have to present? He has what is known as "convenient politics." If the Democrats go in, he has a Democratic record. If the Republicans go in, he has a Republican record.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. O'CONNOR. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] asked if there was any criticism of his official conduct. The only time I met the gentleman was when he approached me here in the Capitol. I did not know who he was. I asked him at that time why he should go over to the Senate behind the back of the House and put in a provision in the District of Columbia liquor bill which the House had stricken out, which provision was clearly in the interest of the surety companies of the District of Columbia. He did not answer me. I then asked him why he should be lobbying in the Senate in behalf of the druggists after we had put an amendment in the bill and after I had repulsed them when they approached me. He did not answer. This is my only experience with him. I do not care about his politics, but if he is interested in the surety companies of the District, which charge twice as much as any person would, and if he is interested in the druggists in this city who sell rotten liquor to the people, it is time that he be thrown out on his head.

Mr. PATMAN. I am not saying this in criticism of my colleague from Texas [Mr. BLANTON], who is one of the most useful Members of this House, but I am sure that if the gentleman had all the information his views would be different, and since he put the information that he possessed into the RECORD I feel that I should put this information in the RECORD, because over a year ago I made the statements that I am now making. When Bride was appointed corporation counsel in 1927 the Washington papers carried the following statement under his picture April 8 and April 9, 1927:

Mr. Bride has always voted the Republican ticket in the national election.

That statement has never been contradicted.

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

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

Mr. LUNDEEN. Do I understand that Republicans and Democrats trade campaign money back and forth? Is there no difference between the Republicans and Democrats?

ISSUE CURRENCY TO PAY NATIONAL DEBT

Mr. PATMAN. We are talking about Bride now. Mr. Chairman, what I really asked time for was to discuss the issuance of currency to pay the national debt. When you make such a statement some people say there is something wrong with the Member of Congress making it, and they would disagree with the idea of paying off the \$22,000,000,000 national debt with new money, but I tell you that it can be

done, and it can safely be done, and that it is in the interest of the general welfare to do it. At the same time we can save this Government \$1,000,000,000 a year in interest charge; that is about \$3,000,000 a day. Conditions do not exist now that have existed in the past. The reasons given heretofore against this proposition do not apply now, because currency can be redeemed not only in gold but in services rendered by the Government of the United States. The Government has engaged in so many lines of business that a large amount of money can be redeemed in services. May I refer, for instance, to the Post Office Department? The Government takes in income taxes, beer taxes, gasoline taxes, all kinds of taxes, even processing taxes. The money that is issued can be used to pay these taxes with. We never had such a condition before.

WILL SOMEBODY ANSWER THIS STATEMENT?

I want somebody to answer this statement on the floor. I do not care whether he is a Democrat, Republican, or Farmer-Laborite. In the interest of the people of this country, I think it should be answered. Mr. Thomas A. Edison said that any government on earth that can issue a dollar bond which draws interest and which is good can issue a dollar bill that is just as good. The only difference is the bond draws interest and the bill does not draw interest; therefore it is easier for the government that issues it to redeem it. The argument that is usually made against that proposition is this: If you issue money instead of bonds, the Congress would just go wild issuing money for everything, and there would be no way to restrain the Congress. Is that argument any good? Could not the same Congress issue an unlimited number of bonds if they wanted to? The only difference would be that it would be harder for the people to redeem the bonds, because the bonds are accumulating interest all the time, whereas the money will not accumulate interest at all.

The other argument that is made against the proposition is that we ought to issue Government bonds so that insurance companies, railroad companies, and all these large concerns that have a reserve to build up can have something that is absolutely safe, something that there is absolutely no question about, in which to invest their reserve. It is a very poor argument to say that the people should pay a billion dollars in interest every year simply to let large companies have something in which to invest their money. That is not a good answer.

PAY \$22,000,000,000 DEBT IN NEW MONEY

Let us turn to this matter of issuing \$22,000,000,000 in money. This sounds like an enormous sum, but we have on deposit, both demand and time deposits, about \$40,000,000,000 in the banks of this Nation. If we were to issue \$22,000,000,000 in money, this money would eventually find itself in the vaults of these banks throughout the country and then the banks would have \$62,000,000,000 in deposits instead of \$40,000,000,000 of deposits. Instead of having just \$1,000,000,000 in money to pay the \$40,000,000,000 in deposits, as they have now, they would have \$23,000,000,000 to pay \$62,000,000,000 with.

UNDUE INFLATION MAY BE PREVENTED

If you want to prevent undue inflation of the currency, it can be very easily and quickly arranged. As it is now, every dollar that is in the vaults of the banks can be used as a basis for the issuance of \$10 in credit money on the average, deposit currency, if you please, or, in other words, in credit issue \$10 to every one dollar that is in the vaults. So if you issue the money to pay the national debt, and you want to prevent undue inflation, change the reserve requirements of the banks so that they can only issue \$3 to every one dollar that they have in their vaults instead of being privileged to issue \$10, and sometimes more than that, on every dollar that they have in their vaults. If there is an answer to the argument, I want somebody on the floor of this House to make it sometime, because there are a lot of people throughout this Nation who feel the same way.

IMBECILIC SYSTEM OF ISSUING MONEY

Does it not seem to you that we have an idiotic and imbecilic system of issuing and distributing money?

When we want a billion dollars we issue a billion dollars in bonds printed over here at the Bureau of Engraving and Printing. We sell these bonds to the banks of the country, including the Federal Reserve System, and the Federal Reserve System and the other banks give the Government credit for \$1,000,000,000—not money, just credit. It is a bookkeeping transaction. Then when these banks want some money they take these same bonds and put up with the Treasury Department that sold them the bonds—the identical paper that was sold to them—and using this as collateral security, upon it a billion dollars of new money is printed at the same Bureau of Engraving and Printing and issued to them.

Does it not seem imbecilic and idiotic that the Government would go in this roundabout way to pay somebody interest when it could be done directly and the interest saved? The argument that is made that you have got to have them interest bearing and tax exempt in order to discourage the issuance of more bonds and to prevent an abuse of the Nation's credit is a ridiculous argument to make.

ANOTHER IDIOTIC SYSTEM

Let me tell you something else that sounds idiotic and imbecilic to me. Possibly there is something wrong with me—I do not know—but there are a lot of people who feel just like I do about it, and that is the Federal Reserve System's use of Government credit.

This institution operates on Government credit. That is its stock in trade. Every Federal Reserve note is redeemable not by the Federal Reserve banks—they do not guarantee to redeem a dollar that they issue—but on every Federal Reserve note you notice that the Government of the United States guarantees to redeem the money issued by the Federal Reserve banks. There is a private institution that has the right any time it wants to issue a blanket mortgage on all the property and all the income of all the people of this Nation and then lend it out to the people themselves at interest, and charge them for the use of their own credit. It is the Government's credit they are using, and they are the Government.

[Here the gavel fell.]

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

Mr. PATMAN. And if you will notice the report of the Federal Reserve banks, those institutions have \$3,000,000,000 of Government bonds. They own them now. How did they purchase these bonds? They purchased them with Government credit, and using Government credit to buy these bonds, nobody on earth should have to pay interest on them. But the Government of the United States continues to pay interest on them.

If there is an answer to this argument I am making that it is an imbecilic and idiotic system that permits a private institution to use this Nation's credit in any such manner, I hope somebody, whether he is a Democrat or a Republican or a Farm-Laborite, will answer the argument. I do not believe they can.

Mr. TRUAX. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. If the gentleman can answer that argument, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TRUAX. It is unanswerable. The gentleman has exactly stated the truth, and I ask the gentleman if he knows of one single good reason why the banks of this country ought to be permitted to issue money today?

NEW CONSTITUTIONAL DEMOCRAT PARTY

Mr. PATMAN. There is no good reason. The Constitution says that Congress shall coin money and regulate its value. You are going to hear a great deal in the future about constitutional Democrats. This is to be a new party they are going to form. These people who have been using the Government's credit free of charge for 100 years do not like this way of taking their monetary powers away from them, and they are going to try to organize a new party—the Democratic part of it to appeal to the South and the constitutional part to appeal to the North, and they will never yield

that it is right for Congress to issue money and regulate its value, as the Constitution itself says it shall do.

Instead of this, as the gentleman suggests, the banks of the country have had this privilege farmed out to them by this Congress—not by this Congress, but by prior Congresses—and we are permitting it and we are tolerating it, and in this way become a party to letting private interests have farmed out to them the Nation's credit to use for their own benefit and for their own welfare and to the detriment of the other people of this country.

Mr. CANNON of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield for a brief question?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes.

Mr. CANNON of Wisconsin. I have introduced a bill to call in about \$13,000,000,000 worth of these tax-exempt bonds—Federal bonds and Liberty bonds issued from the time of the World War down to the present—and save \$600,000,000 a year. Would the gentleman be in favor of such a bill?

Mr. PATMAN. I am in favor of paying them all off.

Mr. CANNON of Wisconsin. There is a petition on the Clerk's desk to discharge the committee and bring out this bill which I wish the gentleman would sign.

WHY LOANS TO INDUSTRY NOT BEING MADE

Mr. PATMAN. Now, we need money in industry. The banks are not lending money. Why? Because they can use this money to buy Government bonds, and as long as they can buy Government bonds they are not going to invest much in industry. Any time you pay these bonds off with currency you are going to force into the channels of trade and production \$22,000,000,000, and then, instead of looking for money, money will be looking for you, if you have something you can use that money for which would permit you to make a return on it in order that you might pay for its use.

Now, there is another way you can prevent money going down in value. They say there would be so much money out that money would go down in value. Well, of course, I have told you that you can change the reserve requirements of banks, but there is another way you can supplement this, and that is to provide that in the event there is a certain amount of money in circulation, they can carry it to the Treasury and exchange it for 1½-percent Government bonds—not enough interest to induce them to keep it there all the time, but enough interest to induce them to put their money to work and get a little something for it, if they want to do this. Then, if they want to invest their money they can take the bond back and get their money. Would not this be right?

The banks of the country have had this privilege for more than 50 years, and if it is safe and sound and right for the banks, why would it not be safe and sound and right for the individuals? In France a business can get a direct loan from the Bank of France. The Federal Reserve banks have the right to make direct loans today, as I understand it, but not one direct loan has been made and will not be made unless you force them. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SANDLIN. Mr. Chairman, I now yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BUCK].

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman and ladies and gentlemen of the Committee, I wish to address myself briefly to the bill under consideration. To the portion of the country from which I come, and I think to the Nation as a whole, there is no more valuable appropriation bill than the agricultural appropriation bill. Its preparation is a work of considerable magnitude. Extensive hearings have been held on all phases of agricultural activities, and I am glad to take this opportunity to commend the careful consideration the subcommittee has given to the Nation's agricultural needs. In view of reports that have been circulated from time to time throughout the newspapers of the country and the numerous inquiries that have reached me as a member of the Committee on Agriculture as to what the effect was to be of

appropriation cuts recommended by the Director of the Budget, I think it is important that the House should realize that largely as the result of the clarity of vision of the subcommittee on agriculture appropriations, with which assistance some of us could give as individuals, the major portion of the cuts affecting western agriculture have been restored.

I understand that the bill restores the entire appropriation for agricultural experiment stations, which are of great importance to the western portion of this country. All the payments available ordinarily to the States under the Hatch Act, the Adams Act, and the Purnell Act are fully restored to the 1934 appropriation level.

The appropriation for the cooperative agricultural extension work, which is vitally necessary to our agricultural colleges, is fully restored.

The Weather Service appropriation for warnings for horticultural protection has been restored, although not to the full amount of the 1934 appropriation. It exceeds the amount of money actually withdrawn in cash by \$1,300.

The appropriation for dry-land agricultural investigations throughout the West, which had been entirely eliminated in the Budget, is restored to an amount greater than that expended in 1934.

I desire to call your attention particularly to the fact that the subcommittee on agricultural appropriations has restored in full the amount heretofore appropriated for the investigation of the sugar plant. I refer to this because I have listened to two entertaining discussions on the sugar situation in the United States and the President's proposed recommendation this afternoon. The so-called "sugar bill" is before the committee of which I am a member.

I want to say, although I have not been authorized by the committee, because it has not gone into executive session on the bill, that in my opinion the Committee on Agriculture in consideration of that bill will give the same care and consideration to the interests of the sugarbeet and sugarcane producers in continental United States that the Appropriations Committee has given in restoring the funds for continued sugar-plant investigation, including the development of native sugar-beet seed. This appropriation presupposes a continuation of the native sugar industry, a position with which I am in full accord.

In addition to that, investigations under the Bureau of Agricultural Engineering into western irrigation agriculture will be continued on the same basis as heretofore. A partial restoration of funds for soil survey will enable that Bureau to maintain its organization and continue the excellent work it is now doing.

Now, after listing those benefits which the committee has been good enough to give us, I want to call attention to one defect in the bill, and I trust that the committee will forgive me.

The State of California Department of Agriculture and State Chamber of Commerce and others have called my attention to the fact that the appropriation made available for the Bureau of Plant Quarantine for foreign plant quarantines has been materially cut under the amount of money actually withdrawn in 1934.

Mr. ELTSE of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCK. I yield.

Mr. ELTSE of California. Has the gentleman the letter of the State Chamber of Commerce?

Mr. BUCK. I have it.

Mr. ELTSE of California. Here is a copy of it if the gentleman wishes to put it in.

Mr. BUCK. The deficiency in this appropriation will mean the elimination of a large number of border patrol stations at points of entry into the United States.

Mr. Chairman, California is a great agricultural State, but its interest in proper border quarantine protection does not cease with proper enforcement of quarantine on its borders; it is just as much interested in seeing adequate inspection maintained along the entire Mexican border and the Atlantic ports as on the Pacific coast.

Perhaps even this matter is not of as much importance to California as it is to the rest of the United States, be-

cause since the 1880's the State of California has maintained its own plant quarantine and inspection service, and, as a matter of fact, 90 percent of the money expended for this service therein today is appropriated by the State of California. But it is of far more importance to us to have the pests kept out of this country, and I only need to point you eastern gentlemen the inroads of the Japanese beetle, the Dutch elm disease, and other pests to show you that it is far easier and much less expensive to keep out pests than it is to eradicate them after they get into the United States. You all know how costly were the efforts to eradicate the Mediterranean fly in Florida, and so at the appropriate time tomorrow I shall offer an amendment to restore the appropriation available to the Bureau of Plant Quarantine for border control and inspection to the amount actually authorized to be withdrawn in the fiscal year 1934.

I do not wish to close on this note of dissent. There are other advantages obtained by the great Western States in this bill. The complete restoration to the 1934 level of money available for the Bureau of Biological Survey in the maintenance of its control laboratory at Denver, and the control and eradication of predatory animals and rodents is of vast importance. It is safe to say that in certain sections of the country the maintenance of our sheep and cattle industry would be impossible without this eradication method being employed. I desire to emphasize the fact that there is a moral responsibility on the part of the United States Government to appropriate this money, and I am glad that my friends on the committee have recognized that, because it is in the forest reserves of the United States, in the lands that the Government still owns, that we find the breeding places of these wolves and mountain lions and coyotes which do such destruction among the sheep and cattle and even the poultry interests of the West, places even where it is forbidden the State, counties, or individuals to hunt and eradicate these destructive animals.

Further, I emphasize the fact that this is only a contribution and an assistance, because over two thirds of the money actually expended in the eradication of predatory animals is contributed by the States and counties and private interests of the Western States.

I think it is safe to say, and I wish to reassure my friends who have written me and who have sent in their protests about what is about to be done by this Congress, that as this bill emerges from this House, and I trust that as it will emerge from the other body at the other end of the Capitol, it will contain practically a full restoration of all the appropriations needed to protect the welfare of the agricultural industry of these United States. [Applause.]

Mr. SANDLIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOEPEL].

Mr. HOEPEL. Mr. Chairman, I freely admit that I know little about the agricultural question, but what I lack in knowledge I make up in sympathy, and for that reason when this bill comes to a vote I shall vote in accordance with the recommendations of the committee. I do know something however about the veterans' question. That was brought up on the floor on Saturday. In reference to that incident I wish to go on record to the effect that in no way, shape, or manner do I consider the chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BROWN], who was then presiding, as being in any way culpable. He is an excellent gentleman and an outstanding Member of this House, and I think the Congress of the United States would function best if it were composed of men of his caliber. What we should have is aggressive youth, and I do hope that the citizens of Kentucky will, by all means, return to this Chamber such an able presiding officer as we had on last Saturday. [Applause.]

I also entertain the same sentiments toward the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] with whom I engaged in somewhat of a controversy, provided he will in the future permit me to advance whenever I possibly can the interests of the people, our disabled veterans, their dependents, and the Federal employees. I bear no animus against anyone, but as a Member of Congress I

shall always be found fighting for what I consider the rights of the American war veterans and their dependents.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the entire letter, an extract from which was read by the distinguished gentleman from Alabama, and to include therewith a short extract from the joint hearings of the Veterans' Committee of the Seventy-second Congress before whom I appeared.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOEPEL. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, as my distinguished colleague from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] read a short extract from a letter which I addressed to the President, a copy of which was furnished him as a member of the Rules Committee (gag committee) with a view to obtaining his sympathetic consideration to the question at issue in the interest of the veterans, I feel it incumbent that the entire letter should be available to the Members of the Congress and to the American public.

I respectfully refer Mr. BANKHEAD to the testimony which I gave before the Joint Veterans' Committee of the last session of the Seventy-second Congress, volume 4, page 1081. I quote a statement, made following my testimony, by a distinguished member of that committee, who, as a friend of the veteran, recognized that I understand all phases of the veteran problem and yield to no one on this subject, even though the distinguished gentleman from Alabama may not agree. Very few individuals in dealing with veterans have any knowledge whatever of the desperate and unfair plight of the retired personnel of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps in their relation to the veteran question as it pertains to their applications as veterans of the Civil War, Indian wars, Spanish-American, and World War. I have made this group (forgotten men) my special concern, while, at the same time, I have made an intensive study and analysis of other veteran problems. Senator Brookhart, a member of the Joint Veterans' Committee, after hearing my testimony which included 28 pages of the report, agreed with me that the present system of having three committees in the House to handle veteran questions is archaic. He also admitted, as will be seen from the following quotation, that I had presented to the committee facts with which even General Hines himself was unfamiliar or had not discussed. I quote from the official record:

Senator BROOKHART. I am with you on the one-committee proposition. I have a resolution like that pending in the Senate on the calendar and hope to get action before the session is over. But, Mr. Chairman, the Congressman has stated a number of discriminations, as I recollect them, in addition to what General Hines presented. The general presented some of these, but I do not believe he presented all that the Congressman did. I should like, therefore, to have this statement submitted to General Hines for comment, and some of these things, if he is correct in basis of fact, ought to be straightened out.

The CHAIRMAN. All right. We will send it down to General Hines as soon as it is reduced to transcription.

I am pleased also to submit herewith the letter which I wrote to the President, from which the distinguished gentleman from Alabama quoted:

WASHINGTON, D.C., February 17, 1934.

The honorable PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES,

Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: While I have been mentioned as being one of your most consistent critics in the new deal, nevertheless, I consider myself as one of your most consistent supporters, as I wish you to succeed, and the only difference between your methods and mine appears to be merely a question of celerity. Many of my most ardent conservative supporters have mentioned that it appears to them that you are striving to attain what I myself have advanced, but that from a spirit of impetuosity, I am inclined to criticize because of the speed at which you appear to be traveling.

Be this as it may, I wish you to have a Democratic Congress in the next session, and for that reason I am asking your indulgence to consider the following:

I consider that I understand the veteran question as well as any man in the Congress and am quite confident that I understand all phases of it better than any man in the United States. With this thought in mind I hope that you will take the time to digest the essentials of the proposed uniform pension law, which was introduced by Congressman GASQUE, Chairman of the Pension Committee, and which, if enacted, will take the veteran question out of politics. There are some pertinent points which are out-

lined in the accompanying brief, which concretely explains the intent of the bill. In the interest of having a Democratic Congress in the next session, may I hope that you will permit the House to initiate legislation along these lines in order that they may face their constituents in the forthcoming election and point to the achievements which are embodied in this bill?

Alleviating the veterans' situation by regulation is commendatory as far as the administration itself is concerned, but it is not a testimonial for and in behalf of the Congressman who is vitally concerned and who must face the electorate in November. Your change in regulations on January 19 and the subsequent approval of additional changes which, in the aggregate, will total approximately \$80,000,000 or more, are outstandingly fair and just. If these provisions are included in the independent offices bill and enacted, the Congressmen themselves will receive very little, if any, credit for this from their constituents.

In the furtherance of returning to you a Democratic House, I would be in favor of rejecting any veterans' legislation which may be incorporated in the independent offices bill and in lieu thereof permitting the House to act on Mr. GASQUE's bill which, I am sure, will increase the expenditures in the aggregate, very little, if any, over those involved in the amendatory regulations which you have approved since the convening of Congress. Following this method, the Congressman who voted for the original Economy Act would, in a sense, redeem themselves with veterans and could be returned.

Speaking recently to Senator BYRNES, he suggested that Members of the Senate and the House agree jointly on remedial legislation affecting veterans in order to prevent see-saw veteran legislation or the incorporation of legislation pertaining to veterans in the appropriation bills. In my opinion, this suggestion has infinite merit in the interest of our party success.

If you would permit Mr. GASQUE, the chairman of the committee, and other Members of the House and the Senate, whom he might select, to call on you to discuss this question, it is very probable that such committee may present to you viewpoints which you could accept and which, if adopted, would insure a substantial Democratic majority in the next Congress.

This suggestion is presented to you for your consideration free from any personal interest on my part as I have consistently defended the veterans and do not consider my seat in jeopardy, but I am solicitous indeed about the political future of some of my outstanding colleagues who voted for the Economy Act and whom I should like to see returned to the Congress.

With this thought and with my best wishes for the success of your administration, I am,

Sincerely yours,

J. H. HOEPEL.

Mr. HOEPEL. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. SINCLAIR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH].

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, a few days ago the people of this country were informed through the pages of the press that a distinguished citizen of Massachusetts, Secretary of the Navy during the past administration, Hon. Charles Francis Adams, had owned stock to the extent of 500 shares in the Douglas Aircraft Co. at a time when that company was said to be doing several million dollars' worth of business with the Navy Department. The implication of that statement was perfectly plain.

That implication was, of course, absolutely without foundation. Anyone knowing the standards and standing of Secretary Adams and the distinguished family of which he is a member appreciates that fact without any word on my part. As one who has known and admired him, however, for upward of a quarter of a century, as one who is familiar with the outstanding contribution in terms of public service made by his family to State and Nation, as one who knows the standing which that family has always commanded, and rightfully commanded, in this country, I cannot but resent the statement with its implication, particularly in view of the difficulty which a denial always encounters in endeavoring to cover an assertion of this character.

My purpose, Mr. Chairman, in requesting these few moments today—I have not been able to obtain them heretofore—is simply to emphasize to Congress and to the country the entire lack of foundation for the assertion. Inquiry indicates that Secretary Adams did not own at the time in question, does not own now, and never has owned a single share of stock in the Douglas Aircraft Co. or any other company having to do with the manufacture or operation of airplanes.

In response to an inquiry, I am advised that Secretary Adams has written as follows:

I am told by one of the papers here (Boston) that someone thinks he has discovered that I own or owned shares in the Douglas Aircraft Co., if there is such a concern.

As a matter of fact, I never have owned, directly or indirectly, any shares of the Douglas Aircraft Co. or any other company interested in the manufacture or operation of aircraft.

Moreover, I sold before coming to Washington all stock of any company of any sort which had any dealings with the Navy Department.

The complete explanation of the matter, Mr. Chairman, as Members of this Committee no doubt appreciate, is to be found in an unfortunate confusion of names, the stock in question having been held by another of the same name in no way related to Secretary Adams, who never has held the position of Secretary of the Navy or any other position in the Federal Government, insofar as I am informed.

I hold in my hand a brief editorial appearing in this connection in one of the leading newspapers in Boston. It is but two paragraphs in length. The words are not mine. I incorporate them in my remarks simply to indicate the sentiment created by the incident in a publication familiar with the standing of Secretary Adams and his distinguished family. It is entitled "A Malicious Error", and reads as follows:

The present administration at Washington, seeking to besmirch the character of its Republican predecessors, stubbed its toe badly yesterday. A House naval subcommittee gleefully let testimony be broadcast throughout the country that Charles Francis Adams, Secretary of the Navy in Mr. Hoover's Cabinet, owned 500 shares of Douglas Aircraft stock at a time when the company was receiving huge contracts from the Navy Department. Informed of the charge, Mr. Adams denied it. Quite rightly, too, because the Herald learned last night that the stock was owned by Charles F. Adams, a Boston merchant, who was never Secretary of the Navy.

To be sure, this is not the first time that these two prominent Bostonians have been confused. But this fact is no excuse for the contemptible innuendo which the naval subcommittee let loose. Through a childish error it led the country to believe that a respected citizen and public servant, a descendant of two Presidents of the United States, had exploited a high position in the Government for personal gain. The administration owes Mr. Adams a most abject apology. It owes the other Mr. Adams a vote of thanks for catching its blunder before it went too far.

[Applause.]

Mr. GRANFIELD. Will my distinguished colleague yield to me for just a moment?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to my colleague from Massachusetts.

Mr. GRANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I would forever reproach myself if I did not take advantage of this opportunity to join with my colleague [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] in his denunciation of certain unwarranted published imputations reflecting upon the character and integrity of one of the Nation's most distinguished men—former Secretary of the Navy, in the Hoover administration—Charles Francis Adams, of Massachusetts.

It is gratifying to me to have listened to the splendid eulogy of him being delivered by my colleague. I subscribe to his every utterance. In my Commonwealth the name of Adams is a synonym for Massachusetts, and the history of Massachusetts can be found in the traditions of the Adams family. Their patriotism and love of country have been as constant as the North Star.

Mr. Adams is highly respected and greatly esteemed by Democrats and Republicans alike not only in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts but throughout the Nation. [Applause.] The Secretary of the Navy brought to the Cabinet a capacity for service and a life of rectitude which denies any imputation of wrongdoing no matter how slight.

No words of mine can brighten the luster of his name. He is a descendant of one of Massachusetts' most illustrious families. Their integrity was never questioned, and it cannot be questioned now.

I thank my colleague. [Applause.]

Mr. SINCLAIR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. WITHROW].

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Chairman, at this time I want to call upon this House to provide an adequate program of relief for the dairy industry. This is a problem which is of utmost importance to all of us. Our agricultural industry is our basic industry and dairying is the leading agricultural enterprise. When farms are operating on a paying basis, our villages and cities prosper. When farms are in

financial distress, it is not long before our villages and cities are also in distress. When the farmer cannot buy, the factory worker is thrown out of employment and the small business man is thrown into bankruptcy. We must, then, rehabilitate agriculture and particularly dairying before we can expect any substantial progress toward recovery.

NEED ADEQUATE DAIRY RELIEF PROGRAM

We passed in this body a few days ago a measure appropriating \$200,000,000 as an emergency fund to relieve the beef and dairying industries. This measure was passed under a gag rule with only 40 minutes of debate and with no opportunity to amend. I was, and am now, very much in favor of this appropriation as far as it goes, but I want to call your attention to the fact that this is a half-way measure and inadequate. Instead of \$200,000,000 we should appropriate \$350,000,000. If the additional money were not needed, it would not be spent, and in such case it would revert back to the Treasury, but in any event the money should be made available. Testimony before the Agricultural Committee revealed that no witness was sure that a sum of \$200,000,000 would be sufficient.

I know of no group of our citizens who are more in need of relief than the dairymen. Almost all dairy properties are heavily mortgaged. The dairyman's difficulties are aggravated because he has a larger capital investment in proportion to his gross income than any other unit of the agricultural group, with the result that when he starts going into the red he goes that much faster.

DAIRYMAN NOT RECEIVING PARITY PRICE

I have whole-heartedly supported all emergency relief measures with the exception of the so-called "Economy Act" which is now generally admitted as having been genuinely un-American and cruel; but these same emergency measures have all reacted to penalize the dairy farmer. The A.A.A. and N.R.A. have had for their purpose the raising of commodity values, both industrial and agricultural, and have in a measure succeeded in their purpose, but during all this the dairyman has not received a parity price. In fact, during a considerable portion of this period the price paid for butter fat was the lowest it has been in 30 years.

The N.R.A. has raised the general price level of manufactured articles which the dairy farmer uses. The A.A.A. has raised the price level of grain which in many cases the dairyman must buy for feed. The result of these two major activities on the part of the Federal Government has been to raise the cost of production and living of the dairyman. He finds himself in a terrible predicament not of his own making.

The beef dairy relief bill, which has been passed by the House, may eventually reduce dairy production to a point where dairy prices will rise and the dairy farmer will be benefited, but in the meantime all other relief projects are working to the detriment of the dairy farmer.

MY DAIRY RELIEF PROGRAM

I have introduced a bill—H.R. 8243—which will provide an additional \$150,000,000 for the dairy relief program. This will make a total of \$350,000,000 available for the relief of the dairy farmer. I submit herewith a program which will give immediate and adequate relief to the dairy industry:

Two hundred and sixteen million dollars is to be used to pay immediate cash benefits to dairy farmers on the basis of 8 cents per pound for every pound of butter fat produced in the year 1933. This will to some extent compensate dairymen for butter fat which was sold last year at a price below the cost of production.

Forty million dollars is to be used to eliminate 600,000 head of dairy cattle infected with Bang's disease and tuberculosis.

Thirty-five million dollars is to be used for the purchase of 600,000 dairy cows which will be distributed in the poorer sections of the South and on Indian reservations which do not now use milk or dairy products. These cows are not to be used to establish dairy herds which will compete with dairy farmers.

Forty million dollars is to be used to purchase 2,000,000 head of beef cattle, and the meat is to be distributed to those on the various county relief rolls in addition to the meat allotments which are now being distributed.

That will leave a balance of \$19,000,000, which can be used to fill any gap which may develop, or if this sum or any portion of this appropriation is not needed the money will revert into the Treasury.

Gentlemen, this program which I have outlined will provide immediate relief for the dairy industry. It will place cash in the hand of every dairy farmer immediately. It is not a half-way measure. It provides not only immediate relief but it also provides a permanent relief policy by taking at least 3,200,000 head of cattle out of dairy production and off the beef market. This plan will work.

PROHIBIT SALE OF OLEOMARGARINE

In addition to immediate relief for the dairy industry, we must take steps to curb the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine and other substitutes for butter. In the revenue bill which has been passed by the House we have levied a tax of 5 cents per pound on all coconut and sesame oils. This will be of some help to the dairy industry as it will to some extent decrease the use of the substitutes made from these oils, but again it is only a half-way measure. Gentlemen, we cannot afford to take half-way measures when we are endangering the existence of our dairying industry. We must take drastic steps to force oleomargarine out of competition with butter. I have introduced a bill (H.R. 4319) which will place an additional tax of 10 cents per pound on all oleomargarine. I am willing to go further than that if necessary—I am willing to bar oleomargarine and other substitutes entirely from the markets of the United States.

The oleomargarine industry represents only a small investment and employs few people, yet the millions of pounds of substitutes which they produce annually are undermining our entire domestic dairy industry. The chief ingredient of oleomargarine is a product of the tropical islands. It is time that we forget the interests of the natives of these tropical islands and look to the welfare of the dairy farmers of our own country.

MUST ENACT FRAZIER BILL TO SECURE ADEQUATE AID FOR FARM MORTGAGE

The dairy-relief program alone will not solve our farm problem. All the dairy relief in the world will never help the farmer who has lost his farm through mortgage foreclosure. Despite newspaper statements to the contrary, the fact is that our present farm mortgage relief set-up is not adequate. The Federal land banks have not given relief to one tenth of the farmers who have applied for loans. Those few farmers who have been able to secure loans through the Federal land banks have been subjected to endless delay, unreasonable fees, and red tape beyond endurance. There is not one feature of the present farm mortgage relief provisions which is satisfactory.

This situation must be corrected immediately, and there is a measure which will adequately take care of the problem. That measure is the Frazier bill which will refinance all distressed farm mortgages at an interest rate that farmers can afford to pay, namely, 1½ percent per year plus an additional 1½-percent annual payment on the principal.

I should like to inquire why there is opposition to the Frazier bill. This Government has aided every other type of industry; why will it not give adequate aid to its basic industry, agriculture? Certainly loans based on the very soil on which our Nation is built are more secure than all the stocks and bonds on which the Reconstruction Finance Corporation has seen fit to loan its millions.

I feel sure that the Members of this House do not wish to see our agricultural industry ruined by conditions over which the farmer has no control. The trouble is that you have been deceived by newspaper reports and do not realize that this problem is more serious than ever before. If you will forget about the newspapers and listen to the farmers of our Nation, you will realize that this is a crisis which must be met promptly.

Where can the farmer turn to refinance his mortgage? It is true that all our banks now have signs in their

windows proclaiming the fact that deposits are now guaranteed, but our farmers have no money to put into these banks, and it is impossible for them to secure loans from these banks. In agricultural communities there is no such thing as credit at the present time.

The Frazier bill will solve this problem by providing adequate loans at a reasonable rate of interest. The Government has adequate funds to finance the Frazier bill. It is imperative that the Frazier bill be enacted immediately before more damage has been done to the agricultural industry.

RECOVER THE LOOT

When farming has again been placed on a paying basis, it will not be long before normal conditions return to the entire country. I realize that there are many other things which must be done. Chief among these is the recovery of the loot which has been taken from our people by all the swindlers and grafters who have been exposed in the past 2 years. The financial deals which have caused our citizens to lose their small savings are no less criminal because they have been carried out by big bankers. Some of this loot has, of course, vanished, but there still remain millions of dollars which can be recovered.

It is well enough to investigate and expose the crookedness of big bankers and others, but no good purpose is served if these swindlers are allowed to keep the loot and go unpunished. The money must be recovered and returned to its rightful owners.

The laws of this Nation were never intended to protect the criminal in his crime, and no court should be allowed to construe our laws so as to protect the big bankers who have knowingly defrauded our citizens of their savings.

Railroads, industrialists, insurance companies, and bankers have received very generous consideration at the hands of the Congress, we have even gone so far as to set the price of gold. In view of these past actions, it is inconsistent, unfair, and un-American to maintain that we cannot make it possible for the dairyman to receive at least the cost of production for his product and in addition extend to him the credit of his Government to save his property from foreclosure. [Applause.]

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

Mr. WITHROW. I yield.

Mr. CULKIN. The gentleman speaks of \$350,000,000. Is not the amount suggested in the bill \$200,000,000 to be divided on a 60-40 basis?

Mr. WITHROW. Yes, that is the measure as it passed the House and as it is now pending before the Senate.

Mr. CULKIN. Three hundred and fifty million dollars is the gentleman's own suggestion?

Mr. WITHROW. Yes. I propose to add an additional \$150,000,000. Of course, I do not feel that this should be split on a 60-40 basis. I do not see how the bookkeeping feature could be taken care of; how, for instance, if a dairy animal were purchased, the transaction could be credited as being an aid to the dairy industry or the beef-cattle industry.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SINCLAIR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. CULKIN. Would not that be credited to relief of the dairy industry?

Mr. WITHROW. It should not be entirely credited to the relief of the dairy industry. The trouble with the beef market is that inferior cattle sent to the beef-cattle market depress the price. So, in the case of a cow which could be used either for the production of milk or slaughtered for beef, what system of bookkeeping could be used to reflect a definite percentage of benefit to either the dairy industry or the beef-cattle industry?

Mr. CULKIN. The gentleman supported the agricultural relief measure; so did I. Does not the gentleman believe it is about time the Secretary took some action in behalf of the dairy industry?

Mr. WITHROW. Yes.

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

Mr. KVALE. If my memory serves me correctly, I believe the agricultural bill as it passed the House contains a permissive 60-40 division of benefits, but this division is not made mandatory. This is left, however, as the outside limit of division, and the division may even be a 50-50 one.

Mr. WITHROW. Yes.

Mr. KVALE. It is left to the discretion of the Department officials.

Mr. WITHROW. Yes; that is true.

Mr. CULKIN. Does the gentleman so understand it? I read the resolution several times and took some consolation from the fact that it was mandatory upon the Secretary of Agriculture to expend not less than 40 percent on the dairy industry.

Mr. WITHROW. That is the way I understood it. I feel it should not be in the bill at all.

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

Mr. WITHROW. I yield.

Mr. DITTER. Will the gentleman express an opinion as to the feasibility of what I understand to be the A.A.A. program with regard to the diminution of the production of fluid milk?

Mr. WITHROW. I would rather not go into that subject at this time.

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

Mr. WITHROW. I yield.

Mr. BOILEAU. As I understand the division provided for in the Agricultural Relief Act, it merely means that not less than 40 percent nor more than 60 percent can be used for the relief of either of these two industries?

Mr. WITHROW. That is true.

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

Mr. SANDLIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KLEBERG].

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to go into detail in bringing this matter to the attention of the House. I wish to advise the Membership that three companion bills have been introduced and reported out by the Committee on Agriculture. They are now on the calendar. These bills have to do with the conservation of wild life—migratory game birds and other wild life. They are essentially companion bills. One is the so-called "coordination bill" introduced in the House by myself and in the Senate by Senator WALCOTT. The second is a bill by Senator JOE ROBINSON, of Arkansas, having to do with the utilization of the national forests and public domains as sanctuary. The third is the "duck stamp" bill introduced by me.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD at this point an article by Mr. Darling, a nationally known sportsman and conservationist, and possibly one of our best-known cartoonists. This article contains considerable information on the subject of the conservation and protection of American wild life.

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

There was no objection.

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

The article referred to by Mr. KLEBERG follows:

[From the Sunday Star, Feb. 25, 1934]

SAVE AMERICA'S WILD LIFE—POOR LAND CONDEMNED UNDER OUR FARM PROGRAM SHOULD BE RETURNED TO NATURE—THEN WILD LIFE WILL COME BACK TO ITS OWN—A FAMED CARTOONIST AND SPORTSMAN TELLS WHY A NEW DEAL FOR NATURE IS IMPORTANT

By J. N. Darling ("Ding")

The absent-minded professor who came down to breakfast, poured the maple sirup on his bald head and scratched his buckwheat cakes, was no more disorderly in his progress toward the goal of his physical needs than have been the inhabitants of this North American Continent in their misdirected utilization of the Nation's natural resources. The mess which we have created for ourselves is equally astonishing and inexcusable. We have just had a look at ourselves in the mirror of depression and realized that we ought to do something about it. A national program for the restoration of America to herself is just beginning to take form. And in that plan to conserve and restore our national

resources the recovery of our lost legions of game and wild life has a very logical place.

Since restoration of wild game must be primarily dependent upon turning back to nature large areas of marshes and upland nesting grounds, any national game program will have to be predicated upon a more pressing economic necessity than just to give the boys something to shoot at. Fortunately, or unfortunately, that economic necessity is urgently present in the plight of agriculture. A greatly overexpanded agricultural plant must curtail its production just as surely as an overexpanded industry must let some of its factories lie idle.

The Federal Government is now committed to the retirement by purchase of several million acres of farm land. As in any other industry, the worn-out equipment, the least efficient, will be the first to be dropped out of production. Nothing could be better suited to the restoration of game than turning these marginal lands back to nature. Industry has retired its unprofitable units from operation for so long a time that it is accepted as a natural law. Agriculture is now beginning for the first time to consider ways and means of backing out of a situation which we have come to realize was socially intolerable and nationally suicidal.

Overexpansion of agriculture came about like all overexpansions—by overpromotion, with all the profit going to the promoter. Land seekers' excursions to the wilderness! Extravagant promises of easy fortunes and ideal climate! Whole telephone directories full of people, lured by the call of the open spaces, vibrantly dramatized by promotion literature, were led like the Pied Piper's rats out into the lean and unproductive acres of the border lands, there to be trapped in economic nooses from which there was no escape. The thin soil was soon exhausted or washed away, but the discouraged inhabitants are still there—all those who could not get away—contributing their meager harvest to help overbalance the markets. When the human family moved in, the game families had to move out.

Other unheeded acres were added to cultivation by slashing away the protective vegetation from the hillsides and exposing the prolific endowment of rich topsoil to erosion. The net result of this has been to smother the once clear stream beds under a blanket of mud. Thousands of cubic miles of America's richest soil are now in deltas at the mouths of our rivers.

Water, the one indispensable element of which nature bestowed a balanced ration in the lakes and sloughs of our uplands, we have hurried off like an unwelcome guest—only to drown the inhabitants in the lower valleys and periodically inundate their fields and riverside towns. (It would be enlightening to see a balance sheet on which the annual loss by floods was set over against the value of the crops raised on artificially drained lands.) Draining off the water from its natural reservoirs has done even more than this. It has started hundreds of millions of acres of once productive land—whole States, in fact—on a speedy road to Sahara. The subterranean water table has fallen so far below the surface of the ground that vegetation can no longer thrive.

And down this path of heedless destruction went also the great flocks of migratory waterfowl, upland game birds, and mammals. They were crowded out of their native haunts by a civilization which could not live on the land after it had been reclaimed.

That is a complete picture of the submarginal lands you hear so much about these days. Their withdrawal from agriculture has two purposes back of it—first, to provide the tiller of good soil a fair market, free of destructive competition with starvation farming; second, to rescue the army of stranded human beings who have exhausted their savings, their strength, and their hope trying to wrest a living from sterile acres. Eleven percent of the farm crops overbalance the markets of the whole farm population. Eleven percent of farm production comes from marginal and submarginal lands. So what?

Well, this, for instance. Wild ducks, geese, plover, snipe, prairie chicken, partridge, wild turkey, and several flocks of Noah's Ark full of mammals, great and small, used to do a great job of living and bringing forth of their young on those same submarginal lands which have made economic tramps out of thousands of human beings who tried to farm them. When we drained the lakes and lowlands we sucked dry the great nesting grounds of our wild waterfowl. When there were no more nesting grounds there were no young ducklings to grow up and take the place of those killed in the annual barrage that greets the seasonal migrations. Even if men had never hunted at all there would still be the same problems of disappearing wild fowl today, due to the destruction of their nesting grounds.

Removal of the underbrush from the hillsides and waste lands, together with use of the mowing machines—their activities coincide with the intensive nesting season of upland game birds—have done the same thing to those species that drainage has done to the ducks.

A sheep rancher's dead lamb out on the desert's rim, with the marks of a coyote's teeth on his throat, led to a campaign to destroy the depredator. Destruction of the coyotes, whose preferred diet is jack rabbits, allowed the latter to multiply until they became a menace to the crops. Now we must go out and poison a million jack rabbits—and we have more mutton than we know what to do with.

Thousands of acres of marshes once produced a greater annual profit in muskrat skins—that's where your fedora comes from—than any crop that has been raised on those same marshes since they were drained. And the drainage bonds are still unpaid.

In fact, we have at great expenditure of money and human energy robbed nature of something we do not want. We have stolen something we cannot use, wish we didn't have, and want to give back. Those sportsmen and friends of wild life who have been collaborating under the direction of the President and Secretary of Agriculture to find ways and means of giving it back see a chance to post a reward for the return of the stolen property. That reward would be the measurable economic returns from a restoration of the wild life and game species for which the 12,000,000 sportsmen of the country would be willing to pay handsomely.

Those 12,000,000 sportsmen already pay at least \$12,000,000 a year for fishing and hunting licenses, to say nothing of the cost of guns, ammunition, hip boots, and traveling expenses. Industrially, the hunter's bill for all accessories runs annually to a total of eight or nine million dollars. That figure could be trebled if an ample supply of game were made available. Game would make a rapid and satisfactory comeback if the marginal lands were restored to it and breeding and rearing of their young could be carried on unmolested by man. If the Federal Government will buy back the pilfered lands and return them to nature, the sportsmen will pay the reward and no questions asked.

There really isn't anything mysterious or difficult about conservation. No incubators or artificial brooders are necessary if we will only give the mother bird a chance. Marauding man has been making unkind remarks about the crow, the chicken hawk, and the house cat, and casting upon them the blame for the disappearance of game. He has passed the buck to everyone and everything but himself, when, as a matter of fact, he is the one who pulled the chair from under mother nature. Now he has been sent to his room without any supper to think it over. And he has plenty to think about; polluted streams, drained lakes, denuded hills, and an unmarketable surplus of farm products—not to mention the poor souls who have no money to buy, even at depression prices.

In Washington at the present are hundreds of thoughtful, well-informed men who have dedicated themselves to the job of restoring a balance between man and nature, between agriculture and industry, and between man's work and his needs. They hope that by wise planning a way may be found to prevent the mutually dependent from strangling each other. Retirement of unprofitable agricultural lands and their use for the restoration of game for the sportsman and wild life for the nature lover constitute only one branch of a studied plan to help balance the human equation.

Since there seems to be a staggering surplus of everything that the land produces, with the one exception of wild life, it seems logical to expect that game may be allowed to take its place in the new planned economy of things.

The President, through the Secretary of Agriculture, some weeks ago appointed a committee of three to study this question. That committee, after careful consideration, arrived at some definite conclusions that should be helpful if its recommendations are not lost in the conflicting plans of uncoordinated bureaus.

Some of those conclusions, as set forth in their report to the President and Secretary of Agriculture, read as follows: "The plan to withdraw by purchase submarginal lands unsuited for profitable agricultural use affords an unusual opportunity to carry out a vast and pressingly urgent national program for wild-life restoration. * * * We find the plan in its general aspects and intent practical, vitally necessary, national in scope, and of great economic and social importance. * * * There is incontrovertible evidence of a critical and continuing decline in our wild-life resources, especially migratory waterfowl, due to the destruction of vast natural breeding and nesting areas by drainage, the encroachment of agriculture, and the random efforts of our disordered progress toward an undefined goal. * * * The economic values are enormous and the cost less than one great bridge or housing project.

"Projects comprising about 5,000,000 acres have, at this writing, been selected and are herein submitted for immediate consideration." (The 5,000,000 acres are submarginal lands which before opening to cultivation were natural breeding areas for game.)

* * * "An ironic commentary on our neglect of waterfowl nesting areas is had in the proclamation of President Theodore Roosevelt setting aside Lower Klamath Lake, Oreg., as a sanctuary, in which he said: 'This is one of the greatest wild-fowl nurseries in the United States—an outdoor museum—which will prove of great value', and in the report of F. L. Lathrop in 1932, which states: 'Lower Klamath Lake was drained after much difficulty and expense and dried up—devastated by numerous fires and abandoned as unfit for agricultural development.'"

"The rapid depletion of the migratory-waterfowl resources now universally admitted to be a fact is, in a large part, the direct result of the universal exploitation of submarginal lands. * * * This destruction of nests by drainage, grazing, and mowing of the lake shores and sloughs has reduced the annual increase from a normal expectancy of 300 percent to a point so low that the annual hatch from all the nesting grounds no longer equals the annual sportsman's bag, to say nothing of the losses from other causes. * * * Natural propagation has been curtailed to such an extent that no amount of further restriction of the take or methods of taking will suffice to restore wild waterfowl. * * * There is need for prompt and decisive action."

And as to the upland game, the report said, in part: "Our supply of native upland game birds, once the finest in the world, has been reduced to a remnant of its former abundance on large areas in the United States. * * * Extensive restoration of wild turkey, grouse, quail, and all other upland game, including fur-

bearing animals, will provide profitable utilization for millions of acres of rural land which is unprofitable for farming and stock raising and much of which is ideally suited to the production of game crops. * * * The destruction of our abundant wild-life resources through waste and neglect constitutes one of the sorriest chapters in our national history.

"The knowledge, the facilities, and the funds necessary for restoration are available if we put them to work. * * * Extensive restoration of one wild life will re-create a national resource of incalculable value which will add immeasurably to the health, happiness, and prosperity of the people of the United States."

The President's Committee on Wild Life Restoration in its recommendations included an extensive program for song, insectivorous, and ornamental birds of nongame species which are approaching extinction, believing that their spiritual and recreational values were equal to the more tangible economic profits of the game species. Big game, including bear, elk, pronghorned antelope, and deer are to have their quota of native range when and if the committee's report is carried out. But books will have to be balanced by counting the economic returns from the flocks of migratory waterfowl and upland game birds for which the sportsman is willing and anxious to pay. At the present time the supply of game falls so far below the demand that the sportsman is roughly estimated to pay an average of \$34 for every game bird that he shoots. Here, then, is a margin of profit which would make even an air-mail contract look like a piker.

Question. How to collect that margin of profit and apply it on the production of more game?

Answer. Give nature a chance.—Q.E.D.

If there is a margin of profit in the price the sportsman is willing to pay for the privilege of hunting, obviously there is a visible means of supporting at least a fair percentage of the former inhabitants of retired farm lands. The subsistence farm-home principle has been theoretically applied to provide a maintenance personnel and custodianship for the game areas. Technical supervision of the custodians would be provided by district game superintendents. The economic benefits can be shown to more than balance the cost of maintenance.

Roughly estimated, the contemplated work of dam building and restoration of the nesting areas for migratory waterfowl would furnish employment for 100,000 men—a figure which must adjust itself to employment conditions and available relief funds.

Permanent employment is calculated to run approximately two men to every 1,000 acres put under game management, and would pay for itself.

Many "ifs" stand in the way of a complete realization of the national program for restoration of wild life, but if submarginal lands are to be retired from agriculture, the plan is fundamentally sound. To the devotee of rod and gun the situation affords more tangible hopes than have been visible since our game species began to disappear.

Mr. SANDLIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, when my colleague [Mr. PATMAN] yielded to me the other day I referred to the hearing of Gen. Rice W. Means by quoting what a high official of the American Legion, who has been connected with Congress for a good many years, said about it. I quoted the exact words of this official. I am afraid that I did General Means an injustice, because I am convinced that the quotation I made was too harsh. I have a very nice letter from General Means stating his war record, and I think in justice to him it ought to go into the RECORD.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to print in connection therewith General Means' letter.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, does the gentleman subscribe to the views as expressed by General Means in the letter?

Mr. BLANTON. I did not in any way criticize his military record. I do not know anything about his record. In justice to him, however, I am presenting his side of it, as he seems to think that what the said official said about his hearing, which I quoted, might be a reflection on his record.

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, does the writer say anything about the attitude of the Director of the Budget on Spanish-American veterans?

Mr. BLANTON. No; he only gives his own record.

Mr. CULKIN. I understood that General Means was particularly interested in this.

Mr. BLANTON. No; he only gives his own record.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman this question: It is my understanding the incident came about in this way, that General Means was president of the National Tribune Co. and the National Tribune had a headline in substance to the effect

that the Members of the House had betrayed the veterans by voting for the gag rule.

Mr. BLANTON. May I say I think that he must realize now that he did every one of the 197 Members who supported the President and who voted for that rule an injustice, and I think he will do the fair thing and correct his erroneous statement in some later issue.

Mr. PATMAN. Is the gentleman convinced that General Means was wrong about it and that he has done the Members of the House an injustice?

Mr. BLANTON. I know he is, because there was nothing in the rule that affected veterans in any way.

Mr. PATMAN. Since the gentleman has been kind enough to make the correction for him—and I am glad that he is—the gentleman is hoping that he will make a correction for us?

Mr. BLANTON. I am hoping he will be just as fair to the 197 Members of Congress who supported the President as I have been to him.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield to my friend for a short question. I have some other matters that I want to cover and my time is very limited.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. May I say that the action of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] in inserting Colonel Means' letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is in accordance with his usual forthright and magnanimous nature in a matter of this character. I have had the opportunity of reading that letter, and I want to say that in addition to the references which Colonel Means makes in it about his military record—and it is a long and brilliant record of service in both the Spanish-American and World Wars, for which he was awarded the Distinguished Service Cross—that he has also been national commander of the Spanish-American War Veterans, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and United States Senator from the State of Colorado.

Mr. BLANTON. And because of such service I do not want any injustice to be done him.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. I can assure the gentleman that Colonel Means has many thousands of friends among the veterans throughout the country who will appreciate the fact that he has been permitted to have this letter printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. BLANTON. I in no way attacked his war record. But in discussing emergency officers who had been retired on pay, I quoted what a prominent American Legion official had said about the hearing of General Means. I would not do him an injustice for my right arm.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, the following is General Means' letter:

Rice W. Means, president.

NATIONAL TRIBUNE,
Washington, D.C., February 21, 1934.

HON. THOMAS L. BLANTON,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: My attention has been called to a statement derisively made by you on the floor of the House of Representatives, January 30, 1934, relative to my military record and physical injuries resulting from such service. Believing that your statement was the result of lack of information as to the true facts, I write this letter for the purpose of reciting what the records disclose.

I was attending college at the University of Michigan when War with Spain was declared. Immediately enlisted in the First Colorado Infantry. On May 1, 1898, was commissioned a second lieutenant, being the youngest officer in the Philippines during the Spanish War. Was promoted to first lieutenant in October 1898. Participated in all the engagements with my regiment during its service in the Philippines.

Was placed in command of a company of scouts under the direct command of General Lawton. Was twice recommended for Medal of Honor. Mentioned in orders three times. Awarded the Distinguished Service Cross for bravery in the performance of acts over and beyond the call of duty. Mustered out with regiment September 9, 1899.

Was the trial court member of one of the largest legal firms in Colorado when war with Germany was declared. Completed the formation of the First Colorado Infantry by organizing one battalion, the headquarters and supply companies. Was commissioned lieutenant colonel of infantry and assigned to that regiment.

Under the new organization it became known as the One Hundred and Fifty-seventh Infantry.

Organized and commanded the Fortieth Division School of Arms. Graduated from officers' school at Langres, France. Commanded the Fourth United States Infantry in the Meuse-Argonne offensive. Was the first civilian soldier ever permitted to command a Regular Army regiment in the front line. Regiment was relieved from front-line duty and sent to the reserve for replacements on the night of October 26-27, 1918. Early in the morning of the 27th I received a severe gassing. My regiment was camped just 1 kilometer east of Montfaucon.

Maj. Gen. Preston Brown, the then division commander, visited our regiment and announced that I was to be promoted and would be permanent commander of the regiment. I tried in every way to throw off the effects of the gassing, knowing full well that if I was required to go to a hospital I could not be promoted, as I would not be available for the physical examination necessary under regulations before promotion could be made. I became so ill I was unconscious. The division medical officer directed that I be taken to the hospital. I was evacuated by division surgeon to base hospital no. 6, at Bordeaux, France. The hospital record as secured by the Veterans' Administration from the War Department shows:

"Treated from June 17 to 25, 1918, for otitis media, acute, suppurative, left. In line of duty. Clinical records show: History—Began at San Diego, Calif., June 16, 1918, at 4 p.m., while attending theater as severe pain in left ear. Cause unknown. Returned home, tried home remedy, came to Camp Kearny, Calif., at 9 p.m. Ear worked at infirmary by surgeon without relief. Referred to base hospital 10:30. Ear drained much pus during night. June 17, 10:30, officer free from pain, ear draining.

"Treated from October 30 to November 10, 1918, for: (1) Colitis, acute, catarrhal. Cause undetermined. In line of duty. (2) Broncho-pneumonia. In line of duty. Gassed; vomited. Trouble with breathing. Diarrhea. Blood-streaked sputum. Crepitant râles left axilla.

"Clinical records show: November 2, 10 days ago gassed (?) phosgene, followed immediately by vomiting, gradually getting worse, but kept on for 4 days. Had to give up 6 days ago, but went to hospital 3 days ago. Difficulty in breathing; quite marked. Some blood-streaked sputum 5 or 6 days. Diarrhea for about 9 days. Has had about 101 temperature every day; cold and feverish.

"For the Secretary.

"C. H. BRIDGES,
"Brigadier General,
"Acting The Adjutant General."

After release from the hospital I saw service with the Fourth Infantry in the Army of Occupation on the Rhine, Germany.

My discharge contains the following: "Wound chevrons authorized (one) Meuse-Argonne, October 27, 1918."

Upon orders from G.H.Q. I was ordered to take command of my old regiment, One Hundred and Fifty-seventh Infantry. I brought it back to the United States and mustered it out at Cheyenne, Wyo., on May 15, 1919. Prior to that by letter I called General Brown's attention to my promised promotion, whereupon he sent me copy of a letter he had written to The Adjutant General, which is as follows:

"1. I attach herewith a letter from Lt. Col. Rice W. Means, which is self-explanatory.

"2. Colonel Means was assigned to command the Fourth Infantry at a time when it needed a commander. He distinguished himself as a regimental commander, led his regiment through the Bois de Foret, and demonstrated on the field of battle his right to the rank of colonel.

"3. I earnestly request that, as a matter of justice to this officer, he be promoted to the rank of colonel, as he requests, if such promotion can be made under existing regulations.

"PRESTON BROWN,
"Brigadier General, General Staff."

Although entitled to compensation from date of discharge, I never applied for or received any compensation. However, on August 9, 1922, the following certificate of injury was issued to me by the Director of the Veterans' Bureau:

"CERTIFICATE OF INJURY

"UNITED STATES VETERANS' BUREAU,
"MEDICAL DIVISION,

"Washington, D.C., August 9, 1922.

"This is to certify that the records of the United States Veterans' Bureau show that Rice W. Means, Kittredge Building, Denver, Colo., formerly lieutenant colonel Infantry, One hundred and Fifty-seventh Infantry, Fortieth Division, was discharged or resigned from active service of the United States on May 15, 1919, and that a medical examination made on May 15, 1919, under the provisions of section 306 of the act of October 6, 1917, and amendments thereto, shows that at the time of discharge or resignation from the service he was suffering from the effects of otitis media, acute, suppurative, left, and broncho-pneumonia, both service incurred, which injury is likely to result in death or disability. Subject to the provisions of the War Risk Insurance Act and amendments thereto, compensation shall be payable for death or disability, whenever occurring, proximately resulting from said injury.

"C. R. FORBES, Director.

"A. J. MCINTYRE,
"Acting Medical Adviser."

On May 24, 1923, the Congress passed the Disabled Emergency Officers' Act providing therein that any officer to receive the bene-

fits of said act must make application within 1 year or he would be forever barred from receiving the benefits provided under that act. As a protection to my family I made application in the regular way through one of the clerks in the cooperative section of the Bureau on September 6, 1928. I have subsequently been told my case was considered and determined by what was known as the toughest board in the Bureau. It consisted of Dr. D. O. Smith and Dr. T. B. Cracroft. I never spoke to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, or any of his assistants, relative to that application. It was determined upon the records in existence.

The membranes of my throat and nose were so diseased as the result of the gassing and resultant broncho-pneumonia that I was compelled to be operated on by Dr. Robert Levy, of Denver, Colo., in 1921.

It was impossible for me to take up my profession where I left off to enter the service, because of this disability. Commander Ross McIntyre, of the Naval Hospital, Washington, D.C., at present the personal physician to President Roosevelt, has treated my throat and nose for more than 5 years, seeing me at least once every week. Never a week goes by at the present time that I do not have to be treated by nose and throat specialists at the naval hospital.

As stated in my certificate of injury, my left ear is of no value to me. Luckily my right ear was not affected, and it permits me to carry on my present vocation.

In 1926, while a Member of the Senate, I was stricken while engaged in my duties in that official position, was taken to Walter Reed Hospital and under the care of that eminent surgeon, Colonel Keller, because of the condition of my abdominal tract, the result of the gassing received in service. Since that time I again was a patient in Walter Reed Hospital and also a patient in Fitzsimons Hospital, Denver, Colo., for the same disability.

From a robust athlete my Army service has so affected my physical being that I am unable to carry on my chosen profession, that of attorney at law.

I am proud of my military record and am willing that not only the record of my service but the record of my physical disabilities be made known to anyone who is desirous of examining the same. I sincerely hope you will cause the facts herein stated to be examined into as to their truth or falsity as evidenced by the records as they exist in the offices of the War Department and Veterans' Administration.

You, in your official position, have deemed it advisable to cast some aspersions upon my military record and upon my physical disabilities. I sincerely hope that after examination of the records as above suggested that your sense of fairness and justice will prompt you to correct the impressions that undoubtedly have been caused by the inferences contained in the statement herein referred to as having been made by you upon the floor of the House of Representatives.

Very truly yours,

RICE W. MEANS.

My main purpose in taking the floor just now, Mr. Chairman, is to reply to my colleague [Mr. PATMAN] respecting his criticism of William W. Bride. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] and I are close personal friends, and I have for him the highest respect, admiration, and affection. It is rarely the case that we are on opposite sides of any question. We are usually together fighting side by side. He is usually so very fair and just about everything that I cannot understand how he has become possessed of such a warped opinion of William W. Bride.

In speaking of the office of corporation counsel, held by Mr. Bride since 1927, and of Mr. Bride's application to be reappointed to same, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] says:

If that is a nonpolitical office I see no reason why Mr. Bride's application should not be given consideration, but if it is an office that a Democrat should hold, certainly Mr. Bride should not ask for it.

In making the above statement my colleague admits that Judge William W. Bride is a man of honor and integrity, able, efficient, and qualified to hold it, if Republicans were making the appointment. He raises but one issue—that Bride is a Republican.

But even his charge of Republicanism is not so very grave, because in the next breath, he [Mr. PATMAN] said:

It happens that up until 1928 everything Mr. Bride says about his politics is true. I think he had a good Democratic record, but I think he changed in 1928 and I think since that time he has been a Republican.

I note that in revising his remarks he [Mr. PATMAN] has changed "1928" where it twice appears in speech to "1927", and has inserted the word "loyal" before Republican. Then in his speech he [Mr. PATMAN] said:

1928 was the year of the campaign between Mr. Hoover and Mr. Smith.

I hope that every person interested in the persecution which Mr. Joseph P. Tumulty started against Mr. William W. Bride will read his irrefutable Democratic record, which I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD last Saturday, February 24, 1934, on pages 3161, 3162, 3163, 3164.

It is funny and an extremely peculiar situation that Bride had a good Democratic record, admitted by Mr. Patman to be good, up to 1928, but that he changed to a Republican in 1928, when Hoover ran against Smith, and yet Hon. Alfred Emanuel Smith, Democratic candidate for President of the United States in that campaign, now endorses William W. Bride, and has urged that he be reappointed Corporation Counsel. If he had turned Republican in 1928 and supported Hoover, and had refused to support Smith, would Governor Smith now endorse him? Certainly not. Would the present Democratic Chairman of the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia now endorse him? Certainly not. Would the present Democratic Chairman of the House Committee on the District of Columbia now endorse him? Certainly not. If he had turned Republican in 1928, having had a good Democratic record all of his life before, which Mr. Patman admits he had had, would Hon. John F. Costello, the present Democratic national committeeman of the District of Columbia, give him the glowing endorsement dated January 16, 1934, which I placed on page 3164 of last Saturday's RECORD, in which Mr. Costello urges National Chairman Farley to reappoint Bride as Corporation Counsel? Certainly not. Would Hon. Benjamin C. Perry, president of the Democratic Government Club of Bethesda, Md., certify, as he did, that William W. Bride, his wife, and his two daughters, have always been supporters of the Democratic Party, not only by votes, but through the press? Certainly not. If Bride had turned Republican in 1928, would Hon. Emory H. Bogley have sworn that for 25 years he had looked after Democratic registrations in Montgomery County, Md., and that both William W. Bride and Adelaide W. Bride registered and voted in the Democratic primary in 1928, as Mr. Bogley did swear, as shown on page 3163 of last Saturday's RECORD? Certainly, he would not have so sworn, if Bride had not so voted, and had turned Republican.

WHO'S WHO

Oh, but my friend from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] says that Bride deliberately listed himself as a Republican in Who's Who. Does Mr. PATMAN object to all persons listed as Republicans in Who's Who holding Democratic appointments? If he objects to Mr. Bride, who holds a poor little corporation counsel's office, he ought for the same reason object to those listed Republicans who hold big Cabinet jobs. He ought to hang the big fish, not the little minnows. This reminds me of what happened a few weeks ago.

On January 31, 1934, as the ranking Republican on our Expenditures Committee, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD] made a partisan Republican set speech, viciously attacking the A.A.A., the C.W.A., and the P.W.A. administrations. He said there was being given away, in lavish fashion, billions of dollars. He said he was told that his committee would not make an investigation unless he was prepared to show that fraud and corruption did exist. He said the newspapers from coast to coast have carried articles and editorials on the corruption and political favoritism which has been brought to light—enough to satisfy any individual that it exists.

Continuing this partisan Republican speech for his Republican side of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD] then said: "Mr. Hopkins says that the C.W.A. program, too, has been a flop." And he said: "Your A.A.A. is falling down. Secretary Wallace has acknowledged it." And our distinguished friend from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD] concluded his set partisan Republican speech by stating:

I see Members on the other side who have proved themselves remarkable investigators. I wish that now you might be freed of your political chains and could get up on this floor and tear the hide off of such methods of spending as now prevail.

Until the above partisan Republican attack, Mr. Speaker, was made on this floor against our Democratic administra-

tion, I had never in any way mentioned any of the Republicans whom our President had seen fit to place in key positions here in his administration. I knew that our President realized that for the Democratic Party to be a majority party it was necessary for it to enlist under its banner men of progressive thought, regardless of former Republican affiliation. And I realized that our President intended, if possible, to keep all partisanship out of emergency relief matters. But it was my duty to defend the administration against the partisan attack mentioned above.

It so happened that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD], in his partisan Republican censure, had attacked only the A.A.A. administered by Mr. Henry Agard Wallace, Secretary of Agriculture, and the P.W.A., administered by Mr. Harold L. Ickes, Secretary of the Interior, and the C.W.A., administered by Mr. Harry L. Hopkins, and the N.R.A., administered by Gen. Hugh S. Johnson. So in defending the President and our Democratic administration it became my duty to call the attention of the Republican spokesman to the fact that all of these four gentlemen in charge of the spending happened to be Republicans, who had been members of his own political household, and in attacking them he was befouling his own nest.

Personally, I believe in the old slogan, "To the victor belong the spoils." I wish this were in force in Washington and in the United States today. If I had my way about it, I would turn out of office this very minute every single Republican officeholder from the top to the bottom. I would replace them all with good Democrats. I would not have one in public office under a Democratic administration. They are misfits. I would put a good, loyal, sound, 100-percent Democrat into every office of the United States.

Mr. SHOEMAKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. No. I am sorry; I have not the time. But I do not do the selecting; I do not do the appointing. Mr. Bride may be guilty of having grown intimate with Republicans at some time or other; but when I fish, I do not fish for minnows. I fish for the big ones. If I wanted to jump on somebody that was holding a Democratic office because he had run with a Republican occasionally, I would not jump on a poor little corporation counsel like Bride. I would jump on a big Cabinet officer.

Mr. HENNEY. Who?

Mr. BLANTON. You will find some of them in Who's Who at one time listed as Republicans. Does the gentleman deny that we have Republicans in some high Cabinet positions now?

Mr. HENNEY. I should say not.

Mr. BLANTON. Is there anyone here on this floor who denies that we have Republicans in Cabinet positions? If so, let them speak. I yield. Does the gentleman from Texarkana [Mr. PATMAN] deny that we have Republicans in some big, high Cabinet posts now?

Mr. PATMAN. I deny that they organized Republican clubs as late as 1932. They were loyal supporters of the President and his policies in 1932 and up to date.

Mr. BLANTON. Well, I will now turn to Who's Who, the authority of our colleague [Mr. PATMAN], and see how some of them are listed there. We will first take up the distinguished Secretary of the Department of Agriculture, Mr. Henry Agard Wallace, of Iowa, who in Who's Who for 1925, on page 3298 deliberately listed himself as a Republican. Was not his deliberate listing just as reprehensible in our colleague's eyes, if reprehensible it is, as was the so-called "deliberate listing" of William W. Bride? If not, why not? If our colleague gets after Mr. Bride, why does he not also get after Mr. Wallace? He has always preached get the higher-ups. And it is a good doctrine. I always go after the higher-ups. I let the small fry go.

Now, let us look at some more deliberate listing in Who's Who. In the 1925 edition of Who's Who, on page 1700, Mr. Harold L. Ickes, Secretary of the Interior Department, asserted that he was a member of the National Executive Committee that was in charge of Mr. Charles E. Hughes' campaign for President in 1916. He also asserts that he was

a delegate to the Republican National Convention of 1920. Why does our colleague make fish of one and fowl of another? Why does he get after Mr. Bride of having been a Republican and not get after Mr. Secretary Harold L. Ickes? Why does he get after the little one and let the big ones go?

Usually the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is one of the fairest men in this House. Yet in his speech he said:

My information is that Mr. Bride helped to organize the National Young Republican Organization here in the District of Columbia.

And elsewhere in his speech he spoke of Bride organizing the Young Republican Club. Now, the man who did organize this Young Republican Club was Hon. Douglas Whitlock, a lawyer here who has his office in the Shoreham Building, and whose telephone number is National 1906. I rang him up awhile ago, and he tells me that he organized this club, that he does not know William W. Bride, and that he never heard of Bride in connection with said club, and that he was the president of said club.

I have just talked with our good Democratic colleague from Nebraska, Governor SHALLENBERGER, who tells me that he has known William W. Bride intimately for over 30 years, lived as neighbor to him here, and that he knows that Bride and his entire family have always been loyal Democrats.

I am surprised that the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'CONNOR] would get up here and attack Bride simply because Bride took District legislation up with Senators. He has that inherent right. We may not agree on the gentleman's construction of Bride's attitude. I have found him a fair, square shooter.

Bride prepared a liquor bill that provided no distiller should own any interest in any retail liquor house and the attorney here for the National Distillers did not like it. He wanted his distillers to own interests in liquor establishments and he denounced Bride's bill as rotten. This was the beginning here in Washington of the whole furore about Bride.

Mr. PATMAN, Mr. WITHROW, and Mr. SHOEMAKER rose.

Mr. BLANTON. I am sorry I have not the time to yield.

Mr. PATMAN. I hope the gentleman will allow this suggestion. My comments against Mr. Bride were made a year ago and long before the said attorney had a word to say about him. I could not be misled by information that was not published until after my attack on Bride's politics.

Mr. BLANTON. I know my colleague from Texas is just as honest and conscientious as he can be, but he has been misled by this propaganda. The gentleman has gotten off on a wrong slant. If Bride has ever been guilty of any wrongful act and you can prove that to me, I will quit him like to hot rock; but I do not believe you can show any such guilt.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SINCLAIR. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CULKIN].

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Speaker, the Great Lakes-Hudson River seaway is, to my mind, one of the most truly national projects now pending before Congress. This project involves Federal aid to the State of New York in the sum of \$27,000,000. A detailed history and the economics of this project are set forth in House Document No. 20, Seventy-third Congress, second session. This waterway affects not only the teeming millions of the East but the residents of all the States bordering on the Great Lakes, and will, when improved as recommended by the engineers, give low-cost transportation, not only to the Great Lakes and New York but to the New England States, New Jersey, and Virginia. It is the connecting link between the systems of canals now projected in the Midwest with those on the Atlantic coast, the canals across the State of Florida, into the Gulf of Mexico, and through the intercoastal canal to the great ports of the South.

The report of the engineers recommends the deepening to 14 feet of the existing Oswego Canal between Lake Ontario

and Three Rivers, and from Three Rivers to the city of Albany, where it connects with the 27-foot waterway now provided by the Federal Government.

HISTORY OF THE CANAL

For the information of the House, I will state that New York State has spent on this canal by way of construction, operation, and maintenance the sum of more than \$230,000,000. This disbursement has been a contribution by the State of New York to the national welfare; for this canal, on which 90 percent of the present tonnage is interstate, is toll free under the constitution of New York. This canal was the historic waterway over which, in the early days, passed the migratory frontiersmen who subsequently developed the great West. Over it passed the immigrant who had elected to make in America a home for himself and his descendants.

The Oswego and Erie Canals were opened about the year 1828. It is interesting to note that the original Welland Canal was opened in the year 1833. These waterways furnished the original water transportation between the Great Lakes and the Atlantic Ocean by way of the Hudson River. The Niagara barrier between Lake Ontario and Lake Erie was overcome by the Welland Canal. Without these canals National and State progress would have been materially retarded. Where formerly it cost \$150 per ton to ship grain and flour from the Lakes to New York, these canals reduced the freight rates to \$12 per ton. Its influence on the development of the Great Lakes region was most marked. This territory at this time was a wilderness. Ohio, Indiana, Michigan, Illinois, and Wisconsin came into their own when these avenues of transportation were provided.

I want to reemphasize to the Members of the House that this waterway route via the Great Lakes and through the State canals to the seaboard has served a great national purpose. It is still serving it. During the year 1933 more than 4,000,000 tons of traffic, valued at more than \$100,000,000, went over these waterways and was distributed to the States of the Great Lakes region. It is noteworthy, according to the well-considered report of the engineers, that 90 percent of this traffic was interstate. It is noteworthy that the tremendous savings in transportation which are effected by this waterway benefit the farmer and manufacturer of the western and eastern States.

DESIRED BY THE GREAT LAKES STATES

Every locality, except Buffalo, and every transportation agency in the Great Lakes region, except the railroads, favor this development. This improvement will give the canal between Oswego and Albany a 14-foot navigable depth. It will straighten out the bends in the river where navigation is now difficult. It will give the bridges which cross the canal a 20-foot clearance. The project has had the careful examination and scrutiny of those great economists, the United States Engineers, who have reported favorably on it to the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the House.

CITY OF OSWEGO

The city of Oswego is the most easterly port on the Great Lakes. The harbor there has recently been deepened to 21 feet. For nearly two centuries Oswego has been the true route to the seaboard. At Oswego is the Lake Ontario terminus of the canal in question. It is only 191 miles from Albany, where a navigable depth of 27 feet to New York City has been obtained. It has three railroads which may be used for the shipment of grain and other commodities during the winter season when the canals are closed by ice. It will interest you to know that the port of Oswego, during the years that are passed, has collected duties amounting to over \$23,000,000.

Oswego is an industrial city, manufacturing boilers, matches, textiles, shade cloth, and various other products. It has the largest paper-bag plant in the world. This plant uses wood pulp and pulpwood in its production. It has the largest valve plant in the world. The banks of Oswego have deposits of more than \$26,000,000. The port tonnage there during the year 1932 was 502,836 tons, valued at \$31,600,202.

The route via Oswego to the seaboard is materially shorter and faster than the route via Buffalo. Part of it is through the open lake, where the maximum speed may be obtained. Part of it is through canalized river, without the handicaps of land cuts, where the boats may move without reducing speed. Through it motor ships carry automobiles from Detroit, plumbing fixtures from Wisconsin, and corn and wheat from the great West. On the west-bound trip they carry sugar, rubber, molasses, and other raw materials to Canada and the West. There are no tolls on the Welland Canal. There are no tolls on the Oswego Canal. The Constitution of New York State provides that this waterway shall be tollfree forever.

At Oswego are two New York State terminals with a 1,000,000-bushel elevator constructed and operated by the State of New York. Other port developments are in process of completion. The present harbor is commodious and offers ample protection in the event of storms.

Nature intended this waterway through Oswego to be the route from the Great Lakes to the consuming East. It is economic and free from hazard. Every carrier of importance who is free from selfishness of locality favors this route. Nature and man has made it a connecting link between the North and South, the East and West.

The engineers voice their approval of this route in no uncertain terms. From their standpoint this waterway through Oswego has no adequate competing route. The Erie Canal between Three Rivers and Buffalo is merely a duplication of the route from Three Rivers to the Upper Lakes. The engineers state that the Oswego route offers greater ease and speed of navigation. The report shows that on the Oswego route to Albany there are 91 bridges. Between Three Rivers and Buffalo there are 170 bridges. This is a consideration of the highest importance.

OSWEGO ROUTE PREFERRED

The engineers show that in the 163 miles between Three Rivers and Albany there are 50 miles of land cuts. Between Buffalo and Albany, a distance of 170 miles, there are 123 miles of land cuts. In a land cut the bottom width is but 75 feet and it is impossible for two boats of modern type to pass in the canal as their beam is about 43 feet. This greatly hampers navigation and necessarily causes delays, which add largely to the cost of transportation.

The records show that between Three Rivers Point and Buffalo, a total distance of about 192 miles, the speed is restricted on 134 miles, or 70 percent of the distance, with a limited speed of about 4 miles per hour. Between the city of Oswego and the Federal lock at Troy, a distance of approximately 187 miles, but about 45 percent of the distance is restricted to 4 or 5 miles per hour, and on 90 miles, or 55 percent of the distance, and full 10-mile speed is permitted. Under these circumstances a boat going via the Welland Canal and the Oswego route can make 3 trips, while a boat going via Buffalo and the Erie Canal makes 2. The saving in the use of the Oswego route is therefore obvious. Under the inflexible law of economics the Oswego route has the commanding place.

With an increased depth in the canal, boats are able to carry an additional capacity running as high as 50 percent. This, of course, gives added economy to the cargoes moving over the Oswego route.

The cry is made that part of this route is through the Welland Canal. For over a hundred years we have been using this waterway. Under existing treaties the Welland is free from tolls due to reciprocal agreement between the United States and Canada. Nor should special heed be given to those who for the past 75 years have blocked the construction of an American ship canal. Time has caught up with them and the economic situation has shifted. Buffalo should not be permitted to take toll of every ounce of traffic that passes through the Great Lakes.

A TRULY NATIONAL PROJECT

I trust when the time comes the Members of the House will support this project. The deepening and improvement of these waterways as recommended by the engineers will give timely and needed aid to the eastern and western

farmer. It will enable the eastern industrialist to lay down his manufactured products in the Middle West at the lowest possible transportation cost. The manufacturer of the Middle West will enjoy a like advantage in sending his products to the eastern market. In both cases the consuming public will be the beneficiary.

I said in the beginning that this project was truly national in scope. It gives relief from oppressive and prohibitive freight rates to 52,000,000 people living on the Atlantic coast and in the region of the Great Lakes. It should be speedily enacted into law. [Applause].

Mr. SINCLAIR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. COOPER].

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time to discuss a news item that was in the papers of February 4, relative to Democratic patronage by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. LOZIER], and inasmuch as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] has just opened up the subject I am going to talk about, I shall reply to the gentleman from Texas also.

In the Washington Star of Sunday, February 4, 1934, we read a news item which states:

GOOD RELIEF JOBS SAID HELD BY G.O.P.—REPRESENTATIVE CLAIMS THEY WORK FOR PARTY WHILE IN DEMOCRATIC EMPLOY

Chairman LOZIER, of the Democratic patronage committee, said yesterday information supplied his committee disclosed Republicans not only held a majority of the more important relief jobs but were organizing Republicans while in Democratic employ.

"Reports from the districts and the States show that in the relief and C.W.A. work, Republicans dominate in the key positions", he said. "Many of them are partisan, stand-pat, reactionary Republicans who, while outwardly giving the President a lip-service loyalty, are engaged in thinly veiled activities for the organization and strengthening of the partisan Republican organization."

LOZIER reported that the department heads so far approached for information regarding appointments had shown a willingness to confer with the committee and that the conferences were making progress.

"Although no concrete accomplishments have so far been obtained", he said, "it is hoped and believed that something constructive will come out of the conferences."

While LOZIER's group was seeking more patronage for Democrats, removal of the question from the jurisdiction of Members of Congress and placing it with the National, State, and local party organizations was suggested in a letter to Postmaster General Farley by Representative KOPPLEMANN, Democrat, of Connecticut.

Asking that the suggestion be referred to President Roosevelt, KOPPLEMANN said Federal patronage matters did not belong in the legislative branch of the Government. He said if they were referred to the organizations where they "belong" a solution over personal matters would be found.

"Much of the time of Senators and Representatives now is taken up with these questions", KOPPLEMANN said.

"Particularly at a time like this, when the importance of pending and prospective legislation demands the full attention of each Member, the continuance of such a situation cannot be defended."

On January 12, Frank C. Walker, Executive Director of the National Emergency Council, announced that "by direction of the President" he had appointed 44 State directors to supervise field functions of the council, together with a chairman of a State advisory board to assist in handling the unusual volume of work in New York State. The list was published in newspapers of the following morning.

A few days thereafter 4 additional State directors were designated, making the list complete for the 48 States.

The written statement of the National Emergency Council, given to the newspapers, said:

In all cases every possible effort was made to obtain for this service an outstanding citizen of the State so situated that he could give it his full time and attention.

And according to reports appearing in newspapers of January 13, in answer to questions put to him regarding the announcement, Mr. Walker denied any connection between the emergency council and politics. He was quoted as saying:

I do not know that I know all of their political affiliations. We have tried to make it as nonpartisan as possible.

At that time announcement had not been made that Mr. Walker had resigned as treasurer of the Democratic National Committee, it having been announced a few days later that he had done so sometime previously, and newspaper

men were naturally curious. His political connection had led to reports that only deserving Democrats, properly accredited by Mr. Farley, Postmaster General and chairman of the Democratic National Committee, would be selected.

But Mr. Walker denied this, according to newspaper accounts of January 13, asserting that the appointments had been made only after careful study of qualifications in which Gen. Hugh S. Johnson, of the N.R.A., and others had participated.

Further facts brought out were that salaries paid the State directors will range from \$4,000 to \$6,000, depending on the work involved. Assistants and clerical help also will be paid. Funds to operate the Emergency Council, which Mr. Walker estimated roughly at \$1,250,000, according to press reports, will come from the Recovery Administration.

It was also announced that the Council will be associated closely with the National Recovery Administration, that reports will be made direct to the Recovery Administration in Washington in accordance with rules to be promulgated by General Johnson. The chief function of the Council, it was explained, would be the dissemination of information by which citizens may know how to obtain Government help from any one of the dozen relief agencies.

In accordance with the plan then announced, a national conference of the State directors was held in Washington last week. On Friday, February 2, President Roosevelt, sitting at his desk at the White House, addressed the State directors, grouped in a semicircle before him. Admonishing them, very properly, to keep partisan politics out of their task the President said:

This work has nothing to do with partisan politics—nothing at all. A great many of you are Republicans, a good many are Democrats—quite a number do not belong regularly to one party or the other. We are not the least bit interested in the partisan side of this picture.

Evidently not. Evidently not the least effort was made by the President and his advisers—Mr. Walker, General Johnson, and the others—to ascertain the political affiliations of the 48 State directors, or the President would not have arrived at the singular assumption that prompted him to say:

A great many of you are Republicans, a good many are Democrats, quite a number do not belong regularly to one party or the other.

Because a careful check of the list indicates no such happy balance as might be inferred from the President's remarks. Not more than two or three of the State directors may be classified as Republicans, even nominally, and at least one of these does "not belong regularly to one party or the other." Over 40 of the 48, or 49, to be exact, as 2 were appointed for New York, are well identified as Democrats. Aside from those appointed from States in the solid South, where naturally Democratic appointments were made, at least 20 have been active in Democratic councils in their States and some of them in national Democratic councils.

For instance, the last and final appointment made was that of Richard L. Metcalfe, of Omaha, as State director for Nebraska, widely known among his Democratic associates as "Dick" Metcalfe, assistant to William J. Bryan, editor of the Democratic World-Herald, of Omaha, in 1894; editor of the paper himself in the memorable campaign of 1896, later editor of Mr. Bryan's Commoner, who received one of those rewards reserved for the faithful when he was appointed civil Governor of the Canal Zone under the Wilson administration.

Of the 20 northern Democrats referred to, one has been a Democratic candidate for the United States Senate, and has been going as a delegate to Democratic national conventions, as have several others on the list. Some of them have been candidates for governor, others have been prominently mentioned as candidates for Congress or have served as Democratic members of their State legislatures. One and all they are Democrats who have been much more prominently identified with their party's activities than any Republican that can be found on the list.

By direction of the President, the Executive Director of the National Emergency Council has appointed 43 State

directors. In addition there is appointed a chairman of a State advisory board to assist in handling the unusual volume of work in New York State. In all cases every possible effort was made to obtain for this service an outstanding citizen of the State who was so situated that he could give it his full time and attention. The State directors designated by the Executive Director are as follows (the Executive Director, Frank C. Walker, referred to above, was formerly treasurer of the Democratic National Committee. Announcement was made a few days after this release was issued to the press that he had resigned his position of committee treasurer some time previously):

Alabama (Democrat): Judge John D. Petree, Russellville. Mr. Petree has served as probate judge of Franklin County for 11 years, and resigns this post to become State director under the National Emergency Council. He has served as chairman of the State Association of Probate Judges and County Commissioners. At the time of his appointment he was an unopposed candidate for Secretary of State. (Listed in Alabama Official Register as a member State Democratic Executive Committee.)

Arizona (Democrat): Steve A. Spear, Prescott. Mr. Spear has served as county chairman of the N.R.A. compliance board for Yavapai County, and has had considerable experience with the recovery program. He has been in business for himself for the last 10 years and prior to that time was connected with the Santa Fe Railroad, in various capacities. He is a bank director and is director and president of the Yavapai County Chamber of Commerce. He has served in the Arizona State Legislature for 4 years and is at present speaker of the house of representatives. He is 37 years old. (Democratic speaker Arizona House of Representatives.)

Arkansas (Democrat): J. J. Harrison, Little Rock. Mr. Harrison is an outstanding executive and business man. He has served for some years as the head of a large insurance organization and has been active in Little Rock banking circles. He has been particularly active in civic work and in this connection is widely known throughout the State.

California (Democrat): George Creel, San Francisco. Mr. Creel is an author and newspaper man. He was chairman of the committee on public information in Washington from 1917 until 1919. At the time of his appointment he was serving as chairman of the northern California recovery board and chairman of the regional labor board. (Nationally known Democrat who served as chairman committee on public information during World War under appointment by President Wilson.)

Colorado (Democrat): Thomas A. Duke, Pueblo. Mr. Duke is 57 years old and for some years has been head of a large wholesale grocery business. He is principal owner and the manager of one of the largest wholesale fruit and produce houses in southern Colorado. He formerly was city commissioner of Pueblo and has been a dominant member of the board of corrections for the State penal institutions and the State insane asylum. He has been serving as chairman of the Board of Public Works of Colorado. (Active in Colorado Democratic circles. Delegate to the Democratic National Convention, 1928.)

Connecticut (Democrat): William Meany, Greenwich. Mr. Meany is a former postmaster of Greenwich and is a successful business man. He has a wide association throughout the State. He is 50 years old. (Active in Connecticut Democratic circles. Delegate to last Democratic National Convention.)

Delaware (Democrat): Dr. Charles M. Wharton, Dover. At the time of his appointment Dr. Wharton was serving as a member of the N.R.A. State recovery board. He also was director and professor of physical education and health training at the University of Delaware at Newark. He formerly served as assistant director of the University of Pennsylvania. He was a captain in the Army Air Service in the World War. He served also as a member of the Delaware State Senate. He has made an extended study of the

National Industrial Recovery Act. (Has served as Democratic member State senate.)

Florida (Democrat): Walter Hawkins, Jacksonville. Mr. Hawkins has an extensive and thorough State-wide association, having been for 20 years a freight and passenger representative of Florida railroad lines. For the last 20 years he has operated his own business of fancy fruit packing and shipping. He is particularly well informed upon business conditions in Florida.

Georgia (Democrat): Dr. Andrew McNairn Soule, Athens. Dr. Soule is a former president of Georgia State College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts, and has had 39 years' service in agricultural teaching, research, and extension. He has been associated with the University of Missouri, Texas Agricultural and Mechanical College, University of Tennessee, Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Georgia State College, and the University of Georgia. He has spent many years studying cotton problems and has acted for this country at world cotton conferences. He was Federal food administrator for Georgia and director of the fifth zone in the World War period. He has been a thorough student of Georgia's economic problems.

Idaho (Democrat): Will Simons, Boise. Mr. Simons at the time of his appointment was serving as chairman of the Idaho N.R.A. State recovery board. He is the son-in-law of former Governor Alexander and operates the Alexander Clothing Co. He has administrative ability. (Father-in-law, former Governor Alexander, was a Democratic leader in Idaho for many years.)

Illinois (Democrat): John E. Cassidy, Peoria. Mr. Cassidy is 37 years old and a well-known lawyer. He was graduated from Notre Dame in 1917 and saw service overseas as a second lieutenant. For some years he was claims attorney for the Aetna Life Insurance Co. in central Illinois counties, and later entered general practice in Peoria. He is a member of the Peoria (Ill.), State, and American Bar Associations. He was a representative from the State at large at the Illinois repeal convention July 1933. (Active in Illinois Democratic circles. Delegate to last Democratic National Convention.)

Iowa (Democrat): John J. Hughes, Des Moines. Mr. Hughes served as chairman of the Iowa N.R.A. State recovery board, and is thoroughly familiar with the recovery program. He has been general agent for Iowa of the Northwest Mutual Life Insurance Co. He is known throughout the State as a man possessing the necessary administrative ability. (Well known in Iowa Democratic circles. Son of John N. Hughes, an old-time Iowa Democratic leader.)

Kansas (Democrat): Jonas Graber, Kingman. Mr. Graber is 45 years old, a farmer, a banker, and a member of the State legislature. He has the record of successful administrative activity. He is familiar with N.R.A. procedure. (Democratic member State legislature; has been prominently mentioned as Democratic candidate for Congress, Seventh Kansas District.)

Kentucky (Democrat): Judge J. R. Layman, Elizabethtown. Judge Layman has been active in N.R.A. work, and is thoroughly familiar with the recovery program. He is widely known lawyer with both judicial and administrative ability. (Long prominent Kentucky Democrat.)

Louisiana (Democrat): Edward J. Gay, Plaquemine. Mr. Gay, at the time of his appointment, was chairman of the Louisiana N.R.A. State recovery board. He is well known throughout the State and has a record of administrative success.

Maryland: Arthur E. Hungerford, Baltimore. Mr. Hungerford formerly was night editor of the Baltimore Sun. He was organizer of the publicity department of the National War Work Council of the Young Men's Christian Association. For 12 years he was chairman of the executive committee of the Alumni Association of the Baltimore City College. He prepared an important report for the railroad brotherhood in connection with the strike on the Western Maryland Railroad. (Not identified politically. Certainly not an active Republican.)

Massachusetts (Democrat): P. A. O'Connell, Boston. Mr. O'Connell is a member of the Massachusetts N.R.A. State recovery board. As president of the E. T. Slattery Co., of Boston, he is an outstanding merchant of the State. He has been very active in civic affairs.

Michigan (Democrat): Edmund C. Shields, Lansing. Mr. Shields is a member of the board of regents of the University of Michigan and a member of the State bar examining board. He is a well-known lawyer and a good executive. (Was once chairman Democratic State committee. Delegate to last Democratic national convention.)

Mississippi (Democrat): Simon S. Marks, Jackson. Mr. Marks has been a member of the district N.R.A. recovery board. He is an outstanding merchant in Jackson and has taken part in various public-spirited movements in that region. He is known throughout the State for his administrative ability and energy.

Missouri (Democrat): Robert K. Ryland, Kansas City. At the time of his appointment Mr. Ryland was serving as legal advisor to the director of compliance at Kansas City. He is thoroughly familiar with N.R.A. activities. He is a well-known Missouri lawyer. (Well-known Democrat.)

Montana (Democrat): Miles Romney, Hamilton. Mr. Romney is a successful fruit grower and also is editor of the Western News, of Hamilton. He was particularly active in the sponsorship of the primary law in the State of Montana. He has a State-wide association. He is 55 years old. (A brother of Kenneth Romney, Sergeant at Arms, National House of Representatives.)

Nevada (Democrat): Frank Ingram, Reno. Mr. Ingram has been particularly active in the practical work connected with the N.R.A. administration. He is an attorney and well known throughout the State. He is 45 years old. Mrs. Ingram has been an active leader of the women in support of the N.R.A. (Partisan and active Democrat.)

New Hampshire (Democrat): Charles E. Tilton, Tilton. Mr. Tilton is 46 years old. He was educated at Harvard University and Massachusetts Institute of Technology. From 1913 to 1917 he was a member of the New Hampshire House of Representatives. He was a delegate to the New Hampshire Constitutional Conventions in 1912 and 1930. From 1913 to 1915 and from 1922 to 1931 he was a member of the New Hampshire State Board of Public Welfare. He served with the United States Army from 1917 to 1919. (Has been a Democratic member New Hampshire House of Representatives.)

New Jersey (Republican): Charles Edison, West Orange. Mr. Edison has served as a member of the New Jersey N.R.A. State recovery board. He is a son of the late Thomas A. Edison and has been particularly active in the recovery movement of the State. He is familiar with compliance problems. He is president of Thomas A. Edison Industries. He is 43 years old. (Nominally a Republican. Not active.)

New Mexico (Democrat): J. J. Dempsey, Santa Fe. Mr. Dempsey has served as a member of the district N.R.A. recovery board. He has had extensive experience with N.R.A. problems and has been consulted frequently at the Washington headquarters. He has been a successful contractor and has special administrative ability. He served as vice president and general manager of the Brooklyn Rapid Transit Co. He has had extensive quasi-judicial experience.

New York (Democrat): Thomas Conway, Plattsburg. (Chairman of the advisory board for New York.) Mr. Conway is an outstanding lawyer with law practice in Plattsburg and New York City. He is a former Lieutenant Governor of New York State. (Upstate New York Democratic leader for many years. Announced his resignation as State director, Emergency Council, on February 4, to become candidate for United States Senator.)

New York (down State) (Democrat): Nathan Straus, Jr., New York City. Mr. Straus is a merchant with thorough experience and association with all metropolitan New York. He was a partner of R. H. Macy & Co. department store. He served as assistant editor of the New York Globe. He was a member of the New York State Senate and chairman of its committee on agriculture. He is president of Nathan

Straus Foundation, Park Association of New York City, and Nathan Straus, Inc. He is a director of Abraham & Straus, Inc. While a member of the legislature he was active in advocating legislation for State-wide park development. He served in the United States Navy in the World War.

North Carolina (Democrat): J. G. Steed, Mount Gilead. Mr. Steed is 55 years old. He has been a successful business man covering the entire State of North Carolina, and is personally acquainted with the State's needs and problems. He has knowledge of the N.R.A. program.

North Dakota (?): Robert B. Cummins, Mandan. At the time of his appointment Mr. Cummins was serving as secretary of the North Dakota N.R.A. State recovery board. He was active in N.R.A. State organization from its inception. (Not identified politically. May be nominally a Republican but has been lined up with the independent faction.)

Ohio (Democrat): Benedict Crowell, Cleveland. Mr. Crowell is 64 years old, and is a mining engineer and contractor. At the time of his appointment he was chairman of the board of Crowell & Little Construction Co. He once served as Assistant Secretary of War. (Served as Assistant Secretary of War, in charge of munitions, under Wilson administration during World War.)

Oklahoma (Democrat): Frank Buttram, Oklahoma City. Mr. Buttram has served as chairman of the Oklahoma N.R.A. State recovery board. He has a record of exceptional administrative ability and was particularly effective in the N.R.A. organization in Oklahoma. He was a candidate for Governor against Gov. William H. Murray. (Was a Democratic candidate for the nomination for Governor against Gov. William H. Murray in 1930. Defeated by Governor Murray in Democratic "run-off" primary.)

Oregon (Democrat): Edgar Freed, Portland. Mr. Freed served as chairman of the N.R.A. committee of Multnomah County, and has been active in similar work in Portland. He is 39 years old and is an outstanding member of the Oregon bar. He is a graduate of the University of Pennsylvania and Harvard University. He formerly was chairman of the Portland chapter of the American Red Cross. He has served as a member of the Oregon State Child Welfare Commission, and the Oregon State Board of Bar Examiners. He has executive ability.

Pennsylvania (Democrat): Edward N. Jones, Pittsburgh. Mr. Jones is the publisher of The Construction Digest. He is 45 years old. He was born in South Wales of American parents and came to the United States in 1901. He has been actively employed in various construction activities and development of coal mining properties. He entered the newspaper business in 1911, and served as political editor and city editor of Pittsburgh newspapers. He was an important factor in the development of the ready-mixed concrete industry in Pittsburgh and throughout the country. (Has been a Democratic publicity man. Understood to be closely associated with Joseph F. Guffey, outstanding Pennsylvania Democratic leader.)

Rhode Island (?): LeRoy King, Newport. Mr. King is 45 years old and a graduate of Harvard Law School. He formerly served as private secretary to Ambassador Henry White in the Taft administration. He has practiced law in New York, but now makes his home in Newport. He knows the State thoroughly. (Not identified politically. Certainly not known in Rhode Island Republican circles as a prominent or active Republican.)

South Carolina (Democrat): Lawrence M. Pinckney, Charleston. Mr. Pinckney is 53 years old. He is thoroughly experienced in civic and business organizations and at the time of his appointment was a member of the Port Utilities Commission of Charleston. He has served as mayor pro tempore of Charleston. His business experience has been in real estate, insurance, and brokerage, covering the entire State.

South Dakota (Democrat): Guy H. Harvey, Yankton. Mr. Harvey has had extensive experience as an organizer and has administrative ability. He has had experience with the N.R.A. program. (Prominent South Dakota Democrat. Delegate to last Democratic National Convention.)

Tennessee (Democrat): Hugh Humphreys, Memphis. Mr. Humphreys is an outstanding business man with a thorough experience in administrative work. He was in charge of the cotton State division of the Food Administration in the World War. At the time of his appointment he was serving as a member of the Tennessee N.R.A. recovery board.

Texas (Democrat): H. P. Drought, San Antonio. Mr. Drought is a graduate in law of the University of Texas. He has had extensive legal and business experience, particularly in the fields of investment banking and real estate. He is widely known throughout the State. (Was formerly chairman of Bexar County Democratic committee.)

Utah (Democrat): Allen T. Sanford, Salt Lake City. Mr. Sanford is 50 years old. He is a lawyer with a good general knowledge of the State.

Vermont (Democrat): Henry C. Brislin, Rutland. Mr. Brislin served as mayor of Rutland for two terms and also has been a member of the board of aldermen and of the school board. He served four terms as a member of the State Board of Arbitration and Conciliation. At present he is commissioner of public safety for Rutland and also is station master at the Rutland station, in charge of the mechanical and operating department. (Active Vermont Democrat. Has been candidate for postmastership at Rutland under present administration.)

Virginia (Democrat): D. R. Hunt, Roanoke. Mr. Hunt at the time of his appointment was city commissioner of revenue for Roanoke. He is 53 years old and has had extensive experience in governmental administrative work.

Washington (?): J. E. Bradford, Seattle. Mr. Bradford is an outstanding attorney, and at present is corporation counsel for the city of Seattle. He formerly acted as attorney for the port commission of Seattle. (Has been a Republican nominally at times, long radically inclined. Reported to have supported Roosevelt in 1932.)

West Virginia (Democrat): F. Witcher McCullough, Huntington. Mr. McCullough is an outstanding attorney with a governmental background gained when he served on the West Virginia State Board of Control under Governor Gore. He has been affiliated with numerous bond and mortgage and finance corporations, and at the present is president of two of these institutions. He was admitted to the bar in 1910 and served as first assistant United States attorney for the Southern District of West Virginia. In 1917 he served as acting United States attorney. At the time of his appointment he was acting as temporary attorney to the Public Works Administration. (Served as first assistant United States attorney and as acting United States attorney under Wilson administration.)

Wyoming (Democrat): Nels A. Pearson, Sheridan. Mr. Pearson has been a member of the Wyoming State Senate for many years. He is a contractor and builder, and has a wide association over the State. He has a reputation as an efficient executive and as an arbitrator who would be very effective in composing difficulties. (Has been Democratic member State senate and prominently mentioned as candidate for Governor and United States Senator.)

Maine (Democrat): Edward P. Murray, Bangor. Mr. Murray has served as vice chairman of the Maine N.R.A. State Recovery Board and has been its most active member. He is an outstanding lawyer. (Prominent Maine Democrat.)

Since this list was prepared the following selections have been made:

Indiana (Democrat): Fred Hoke, Indianapolis. Mr. Hoke is a widely known business man and manufacturer. He has been a national organizer and leader in the community chest movement. He has a State-wide association.

Minnesota (Democrat): Mrs. Anna Dickie Olesen, Northfield. Mrs. Olesen is an outstanding agricultural economist and thoroughly familiar with Minnesota recovery needs. She has been active in business. (Has long been active in Democratic politics. Was Democratic candidate for United States Senator in 1922. Delegate to Democratic National Conventions, 1928, 1932.)

Wisconsin (Democrat): A. Matt Werner, Sheboygan. Mr. Werner is 49 years old. He is a lawyer and is outstanding

in his profession in the State. He has had extensive experience in the publishing business. (Prominent Wisconsin Democrat. Delegate to last Democratic National Convention.)

Nebraska: As I read a short time ago, Richard Lee Metcalf, a very prominent Democrat, has been appointed.

I wanted to bring this to the attention of the House today. I am not objecting to Democrats being appointed. What I am objecting to is having men continually getting up on the floor of the House and making the statement that this administration has appointed prominent Republicans to all these key positions in the P.W.A. work. I wanted to get this information in the RECORD so we would know the men who have been appointed by this administration.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield for one question?

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Certainly.

Mr. BLANTON. What is the politics of Mr. Secretary Harold L. Ickes?

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. I would not call him a Republican.

Mr. BLANTON. Has he not been a staunch Republican, and attended Republican conventions?

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Not that I ever knew of. The only time I have heard him classified as a Republican has been when I heard the statement of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] here on the floor.

Mr. BLANTON. What is the politics of Mr. Secretary Henry Agard Wallace?

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. What was his politics in the last campaign? Answer me that question.

Mr. BLANTON. What has been his politics for many years out in Iowa?

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Who was he for in the last campaign?

Mr. BLANTON. Does the gentleman deny that he has been a Republican for many years in Iowa?

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. I know his father was a good Republican; never heard of his son being a Republican.

Mr. BLANTON. Has he not been running a Republican newspaper?

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. That I do not know, but I know he was campaigning for Roosevelt and the Democratic Party in the fall of 1932.

Mr. BLANTON. What is the politics of Gen. Hugh S. Johnson?

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. I do not know anything about General Johnson, but I do not think he is a Republican.

Mr. BLANTON. Our good friend from Ohio [Mr. COOPER], although he sits on the other side of the aisle, has always been such a splendid citizen and able legislator, that he would qualify as a first-class Democrat himself, and he is not very familiar with all Republicans.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. As I said a moment ago, I am not criticizing. I believe you people who have the responsibility of carrying on the affairs of this Government at this time should choose men upon whom you can depend and who will carry out the policies of the present Democratic administration, but do not stand on this floor and try to make the people of the country believe that all the mistakes that are being made by this administration come from Republicans who have been appointed by President Roosevelt. [Applause.]

Mr. BROWN of Kentucky. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Kentucky. I do not rise to make any criticism of the administration but to make this observation: The gentleman quoted the remarks of the President of the United States to the C.W.A. relief workers, and then read the list of the P.W.A. officials.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Oh, no.

Mr. BROWN of Kentucky. If the gentleman will investigate he will find, as in the case of Colorado, that that is true in other States—the officials read are of the P.W.A. and not the C.W.A. And on further investigation, I do not say that I am not in favor of good Democrats being appointed, but I do not criticize the President where he has taken able men

from your party who supported him and used them to make effective the operation of the new deal. As one Democrat I am glad he is doing it, because we have to have progressives from your party to make our minority party a majority party. I am glad to see him take the strength from your party and add it to the strength of the Democratic Party so that now you are going to be the minority party while we will be the majority party. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. I want to reiterate that I think the President, charged with the administration of this Government, should be careful whom he appoints. There is no question but a lot of these men who are chosen for this particular work are able, honest, conscientious men and will perform their duty very efficiently, but what I am objecting to is that someone like my friend Mr. BLANTON, from Texas, stands up, and if any little mistake has been made, blames it on some poor, insignificant little fellow that he calls a Republican.

Mr. BLANTON. Let me say to the gentleman that I did not refer to Republicans being in our Democratic administration until I was forced to answer the remarks of my friend from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD], your new Republican spokesman, who was criticizing these Republican heads of departments. I told him he was criticizing his own household. He was befouling his own nest. I was defending our Democratic administration. I am making no criticism of the administration. I am standing by the President, who made his own selections, and he made them to suit himself.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. The gentleman from Texas said 15 minutes ago that if he had his way he would abolish every Republican who had any place in the administrative affairs of the present administration.

Mr. BLANTON. I said that I would replace all Republicans with good Democrats if I were in the White House. But I am not in the White House. [Laughter.] But I am backing my Democratic administration 100 percent, regardless of the fact that it has some Republicans at the head of some of our departments. I am hoping that wholesome association will eventually make them good Democrats.

Mr. BOILEAU. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. BOILEAU. In the reference that the gentleman made in quoting the President's remarks, it has been said that he was speaking to a group of C.W.A. officials. I believe that that statement was made to a group of directors of the Federal Emergency Relief.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. DE PRIEST. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. DE PRIEST. In answer to the gentleman, I want to say that the administration, if it wants efficiency, must take Republicans, and the Democrats know it.

Mr. BROWN of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. No. I promised to take only a few minutes, and I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. SANDLIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. LOZIER].

Mr. LOZIER. Mr. Chairman, I hold my colleague, the gentlemen from Ohio [Mr. COOPER] in high esteem. He is a good legislator, and I am sure he would not knowingly create a wrong impression, but he has failed to prove the proposition he set out to establish. When Pope's translation of the Iliad was published, Jeffrey of the Edinburgh Review said, "It is a great poem, Mr. Pope, but don't call it the Iliad", meaning that the poem was not an accurate translation of Homer's great epic. And while the gentleman from Ohio has made a good speech, he has not shown the facts or demonstrated that Republicans do not in many States, counties, and cities dominate the C.W.A. and Federal Relief Administration.

The gentleman's remarks were prompted by an interview I gave the Associated Press on February 4 in which I said:

Reports from the districts and the States show that in the relief and C.W.A. work Republicans dominate in the key positions. Many

of them are partisan, stand-pat, reactionary Republicans who, while outwardly giving the President a lip-service loyalty, are engaged in thinly veiled activities for the organization and strengthening of the partisan Republican organization.

I stand on that statement and its accuracy cannot be questioned. The condition to which I have referred, I regret to say, exists in many cities, counties, and States, and this situation is a matter of general knowledge.

I might say in passing that the patronage problem is a subject over which Congress has no control. It is a subject that concerns Democrats and Democrats only, and this patronage problem will be settled and settled properly by a Democratic president to the satisfaction of Democrats.

Having been chosen by my Democratic colleagues as chairman of a special committee to make a survey of patronage conditions, to the end that under a Democratic national administration, Democrats may replace Republicans in positions that are essentially political; and as the work of my committee has not been completed, I do not think it would be proper for me to discuss patronage matters in detail in this body, because, as I have stated, the Congress has no control over patronage matters.

But in view of the remarks of my colleague from Ohio [Mr. COOPER], I am justified in saying that neither President Roosevelt nor the Democratic Party ever intended to make spoils organizations of the agencies created for relief and charitable purposes. At no time has President Roosevelt or the responsible heads of the administration intended to make these relief organizations an adjunct of the Democratic Party, and as convincing proof that the President did not play politics in his efforts to relieve human misery, I call your attention to the fact that our great Democratic President called to his aid many Republicans, to whom he assigned responsible positions, and this action merits the approval of every fair-minded person in America.

It was the President's purpose to divorce these charitable agencies from politics; but, unfortunately, in the C.W.A. and Federal Emergency Relief Administration an exceedingly large number of hard-boiled, reactionary Republicans were placed in responsible or key positions in counties, cities, districts, and States, and this particular group, running true to form, took advantage of their positions, injected partisanship into the administration of these charitable organizations, and in appointing agents and employees, and in employing labor Democrats were discriminated against and Republicans favored.

I am glad to state that in a large majority of cases Republicans who engaged in the relief and C.W.A. work were as free from partisanship as the Democrats, and in trying to relieve human suffering and improve conditions, the great mass of Republicans rendered patriotic and valuable service and did not seek to inject politics into the administration of these agencies.

I am not complaining because Republicans had a part in the C.W.A. and relief activities, but I am protesting against the action of a large number of Republicans who were given places in these organizations, and who forthwith proceeded to honeycomb the local, county, and State organizations with Republicans whose chief object seems to have been to build up the local, county, or State Republican organization.

In my statement to the Associated Press, in speaking of Republicans who held key positions in the relief and C.W.A. work, I stated that many, not all, were partisan, stand-pat, reactionary Republicans, who, while outwardly giving the President a lip-service loyalty, were nevertheless engaged in thinly veiled activities for the organization and strengthening of the partisan Republican organizations.

While I commend the millions of good Democrats and Republicans who patriotically, unselfishly, and successfully labored to relieve suffering and improve social, civic, and economic conditions, I just as strongly condemn the Republican or Democrat connected with these organizations, who played politics with them, or used them to promote the fortunes of either political party.

The gentleman from Ohio has read the names of a large number of persons connected with, not only the relief and C.W.A. work, but other emergency organizations, and he has

not shown that a majority of those persons are Democrats. Some of the persons he mentioned, if classified as Democrats, are of an off-brand.

When I speak of Democrats, I do not mean denatured Democrats, or fair-weather Democrats, or occasional Democrats, or persons who had been lifelong Republicans, but saw the handwriting on the wall in 1932 and voted for Mr. Roosevelt. I mean real, loyal, militant, dependable Democrats. When I said that a majority of the key positions in the C.W.A. work are filled by Republicans, I refer to men who throughout their lives have been identified with the Republican Party, who in the past have given their allegiance to that party and served it in responsible positions. I mean that group of Republicans who, when they were appointed to responsible positions in the relief and C.W.A. work, were unable to divorce themselves from their political predilections, or abandon their political activities. This group of Republicans selected their helpers from the ranks of Republican campaign workers, thereby mobilizing the Republican forces for the approaching election.

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

Mr. LOZIER. Yes; I yield.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. I do not believe there ought to be any politics in these relief organizations.

Mr. LOZIER. I agree with the gentleman. The Democratic Party never intended or desired that these relief organizations should become political agencies or machines, but, on the other hand, Democrats most vigorously protest against these organizations being manipulated by Republicans for political purposes. The President did not intend that politics should enter into the administration of these humane agencies, but in many towns, counties, and States certain groups of Republicans, who held their positions by the grace of a Democratic President and by the tolerance of the Democratic Party, failed to recognize the proprieties of the occasion and the sanctity of the situation, and, unmindful of their responsibility and unappreciative of the confidence the President had reposed in them and unable to resist their long-indulged partisan impulses, proceeded to inject politics into these relief activities.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. I do not believe there ought to be any partisan politics in relief work. You cannot afford to play politics with destitution and misery. If you have men that are in this work and they are Republicans and playing politics, the gentleman's party is in power and you have the authority to remove them at once.

Mr. LOZIER. I have no power to remove them, and as the activities of the C.W.A. may terminate in a few months little could now be accomplished by their separation from the service. But, they should be admonished to discontinue their partisan activity. Republicans working in any capacity and in any activity, under President Roosevelt's administration should not be allowed to use their positions to build up the Republican Party and thereby defeat the Democratic Party in the approaching election, and the defeat of President Roosevelt in 1936, which is the main objective of the stand-pat, reactionary wing of the Republican Party.

The CHAIRMAN. The time for the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. SANDLIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 minutes more.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. If you have Republicans on these boards, who are playing partisan politics with the relief program, I as one Republican stand ready to assist you in getting rid of them just as soon as we possibly can.

Mr. LOZIER. On that proposition I am in full accord with your views.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LOZIER. I yield to my colleague from Texas.

Mr. BLANTON. I want to call the attention of my friend from Missouri to the fact that the first partisan criticism on this floor was the specially prepared, partisan, Republican speech of our friend from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD] the

other day, when he made his criticism against the administrators of the three great agencies, the A.A.A., the F.W.A., and the C.W.A. He is the one who brought it onto this floor from the other side of the aisle. It was an especially prepared Republican speech, attacking the administration, made in a partisan way, by one of the bellwethers of Mr. SNELL's Republican organization over there.

Mr. LOZIER. Neither Democratic nor Republican politics should have any place in these relief agencies, and in the interview I gave a few weeks ago, I stated that, while under the last three Republican Presidents the civil service law had been ruthlessly ravished and maladministered, I do not advocate the introduction of the spoils policy into such of the recently created agencies as are primarily charitable and organized to relieve human misery, but as to the personnel of these, while maintaining a fair balance between the political parties, I nevertheless believe that their management and administration should very largely be in the hands of those in political harmony with the administration, so as to insure success of the administration policies.

Subject to the foregoing limitation, I insist that Democrats should be appointed to all Federal positions that are essentially political, or which, under our long-established political system, are recognized as political appointments and customarily filled by representatives of the party in power. In this group I include the personnel of all newly created governmental agencies, except those organized primarily for charitable purposes.

Under Republican administrations Democrats did not complain because Republicans filled the Federal offices, but under a Democratic administration, undeniably these positions should be filled by deserving Democrats. [Applause.] [Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SANDLIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW].

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I believe the time has come in the development of our national program when we should devote our thought to the advancement of recovery through natural processes. At the present time half of America is clamoring to get on a Federal pay roll. This is a very unhealthy condition. As rapidly as possible we should take the Government out of the employment equation by making it possible for industry to resume normal operations.

Let us make it possible for natural laws to operate in putting the country on its feet.

I am now thinking especially of the importance of getting business and industry in shape to take over the load of employment when the Civil Works Administration expires on or about May 1, and when we shall be faced with the problem as to how the multitudes now employed on Civil Works may be absorbed in normal activities.

I have asked for an allotment of time in this debate to call the attention of the House and the country to what I believe to be the most important proposition now before this Congress as an aid—I may say an indispensable aid—to the restoration of normal business activities and the resumption of employment, and that is a wisely safeguarded provision whereby direct loans may be made through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to reliable firms and corporations for working capital to start the wheels of industry. On the opening day of the present session of Congress I introduced a bill, which follows:

To aid in the resumption and carrying on of normal business and industrial activities, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized to make direct loans to approved firms and corporations, such loans in all cases to be made under proper safeguards and to be based on securities that are adequate to guarantee repayment of principal and interest in full: *Provided*, That such loans shall be limited to providing funds for working capital.

All of us know that the United States Treasury will not stand for an unlimited time the drain caused by the Civil Works program, and I believe the enactment of the bill I have introduced, or one similar to it, will furnish the answer that is uppermost in so many minds: "What will come after Civil Works?"

POINTS WAY TO NORMALCY

I think it is quite clear that here is the way toward industrial normalcy. Here is the program that will erect the bridge between Civil Works and regular employment. Industry stands ready to do its part, but industry cannot do its part because, speaking broadly, it has no working capital. I am referring now not to the enormous businesses that may be better fortified financially but to the thousands upon thousands of smaller concerns that make up the bone and sinew of the American business fabric. They have valuable assets but no money to buy raw materials and to pay work hands, and if they take their securities to a bank to pledge them for working capital they cannot borrow a dime.

And be it said to the credit of these thousands upon thousands of business and manufacturing concerns that they are 100 percent patriotic and want to do their full duty toward lifting their country out of its distress. There is no doubt about that. Given an opportunity to borrow working capital they will call the millions now on Civil Works into the factories and workshops. Smoke will start in the factory chimneys, the wheels will whirl once more, and business will begin to hum.

So I say, without criticizing the recovery program up to date, because it has been more or less a process of doing the best one knew how to do and trusting to luck, the time unmistakably has come when we should cease spending and begin lending; when the dollars of Uncle Sam should be loaned for working capital to reliable concerns on unimpeachable security with a warrant that ultimately every dollar will come back with interest to the Federal Treasury. This is a way to lend the credit of the Government to business and industry on a gigantic scale with assurance in advance of benefits to millions of people. This is a form of Government assistance that is sound and logical.

UNECONOMIC PUBLIC WORKS

Let us stop and think and analyze some of the things we are doing under the Public Works Administration and then consider how much better the money could be employed if it were loaned—not donated—to industries for working capital. At a time when we are cutting down crop allotments, killing off pigs to reduce livestock, and advising cotton farmers to plow up every third row, we have allocated through the Public Works Administration \$15,000,000 to start work on the Columbia Basin reclamation project which will swell the food and livestock supply, and the cost of which, according to some estimates, may ultimately reach from three-quarters of a billion to a billion dollars. Let us take note of what could have been done with that \$15,000,000 by way of furnishing working capital to dependable concerns that desire to start operations. Allotting \$25,000 to each concern for working capital, that \$15,000,000 which, I think, is wasted in the Columbia Basin as far as any national economic needs are concerned, would give capital to 600 concerns which would enable them to employ untold thousands of workmen now on the Civil Works rolls or on relief, and in the end nothing would be wasted, for the loans, with interest, would be repaid to the Government. I merely cite this as one example. There are many instances where the Public Works Administration has allotted from \$500,000 to \$5,000,000 and more to projects to relieve unemployment. These are in the form of direct outlays, and not loans on which the Government will recover principal and interest. Think of what even half a million dollars would mean toward relieving unemployment if loaned to industries as working capital. That would be \$25,000 each for 20 factories. That would mean employment to thousands of men who, when they begin to earn, would pay their grocers and butchers and landlords, and their earnings would benefit the entire community, and finally the Federal Treasury, which represents the taxpayers of the country, would get back the \$500,000 and the interest earned on it. That, I submit, is good business.

TESTIMONY OF JESSE H. JONES

But, asks someone, why do not the banks which receive large funds from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation make loans to industries for working capital? Without stopping to reason why, it is sufficient to state that they do not

do so. I fear that there is a lot of substance in the remark of one man whom I heard express himself on this subject. He said:

We used to speak of banks of deposit and discount. Now we have banks of deposit but not of discount.

Jesse H. Jones, chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, revealed the naked truth in regard to the banking situation when he said in an address to the New York State Bankers' Association the other night:

The common cry almost everywhere is that the banks are not lending. Your Representatives in Congress continually get it, and there is a persistent demand upon them to authorize the R.F.C. to make direct loans. Unless deserving borrowers can get credit at the banks, you need not be surprised if Congress yields to this pressure.

The question therefore follows, Will our banking be continued in private hands or of necessity be supplanted by the Government? The answer is with you—the banker.

In the normal operations of business in normal times banks have a public-service relationship to the community. Theirs is the duty to assist business and enterprise to the extent they may be able to do so and at the same time keep good faith with their depositors. But it is true now, as it has been true for a year or longer, that the banks, generally speaking, are not lending money even on unchallenged security. I am not blaming them because they are not carrying out in full measure their public-service function. They are pursuing a safety-first policy of holding themselves in a state of the highest liquidity while the storm is blowing, and that is quite natural. I am not blaming the bankers at all.

INDUSTRIES ARE STARVING

But as long as this condition lasts, as long as bankers remain panicky and stay close to the shore, industries will starve for want of working capital, and there will be no prospect for a successful transition of men from Civil Works and the relief rolls to regular employment. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation knows that the banks are not making loans, even when the security is ample and the usual banking rules and regulations are complied with. Many specific instances of that kind have been brought to the Corporation's attention, illustrating most impressively the fatuity of Congress appropriating vast sums to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to relieve industry by the circuitous route that has so far been followed. It simply does not work in times like we now have in this country. The other day we appropriated \$850,000,000 to replenish the fund to be loaned by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to banks. That vast sum, I predict, will be short-circuited before it reaches the industries that so greatly need it for working capital. The remedy is to make direct loans to industries under all proper safeguards.

BUSINESS MEN AROUSED

I have been immensely pleased by the support that has rallied to my bill, or, rather, I should say, to the principle of direct loans to industry, as I have no pride of authorship and am interested only in the principle. This support comes from conservative thinkers who deal with problems of recovery from a practical standpoint. I do not want to burden the Record with these expressions, but from a large sheaf of letters and telegrams I would like to cite a few excerpts to illustrate the trend of thought among hard-headed business men. The Indiana State Chamber of Commerce, an organization which represents the business life of our State, wired:

We heartily approve your efforts for industrial loans. Indiana industry must have relief to go forward.

W. H. ARNETT,
Managing director.

And here is testimony of the first importance in respect to the great impetus to industrial revival which may be expected if my bill becomes a law. The writer of this letter, Mr. T. P. Nickell, is president of the Great States Corporation, of Shelbyville, Ind. He writes:

There isn't any question about the fact that \$500,000,000 loaned direct to industry would create at least a billion pay roll during the year 1934. This money would certainly be loaned at a loss not to exceed 6 percent, and the Government could be very liberal with

their loans and still not lose over 6 percent, so in any event it would be a self-liquidating proposition, as 6 percent could be charged for this money.

W. H. Insley, president of the Insley Manufacturing Co., of Indianapolis, writes:

This bill seems to me to fill a gap in the reconstruction program which is fundamental. Certainly until capital-goods industries get under way we can have no approach to prosperity in this country. Capital-goods industries are flat because working capital is no longer available.

Mark R. Gray, publisher of the Indianapolis Commercial, says:

I want to commend you on your effort to make easier the road of the business man who desires to take advantage of the R.F.C. This is a great work.

John F. Unger, of the Unger-Kramer Co., of Peru, Ind., writes:

Inasmuch as the money the Government is spending for C.W.A. labor will never come back it would seem a good proposition for the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to loan money direct to industries, as I believe that a greater part of this would be paid back. If \$50,000 to \$75,000 could be loaned to Peru industries it would assure employment of at least 500 of the 885 men that are now on C.W.A. projects. I fully believe that the great majority of this loan would be returned to the Government within a 5-year period, which should be the time limit of all loans. The money spent on C.W.A. projects will never be returned, and this seems the only way to taper off Government expenditures for relief purposes.

JOHN E. FREDRICK'S VIEWS

John E. Fredrick, of the Continental Steel Corporation, Kokomo, Ind., is one of the outstanding business men of the country. In Indiana he is hailed as one of our greatest leaders in manufacturing and civic enterprises and he is widely consulted on matters pertaining to business and industrial recovery. In a letter he says:

I think that you have treated this subject very well and are on the right track. Certainly, in the rehabilitation program, it is necessary that we keep our industries in position to absorb the men who are now being employed under the C.W.A. program. Many of these industries find at the present time their working capital impaired and they really need credit. In the beginning of the readjustment banks will probably not extend credit, which will cripple the industries' activities in the United States seriously. I believe that every manufacturing concern that has a stable line, the demand for which is established, with good management and a record of successful progress in the past, should receive the support of the Government in aiding them to get on their feet and employ labor.

At the present time there is considerable activity being manifested in industry. The public is buying rather liberally and the volume of orders coming out is mounting day by day, so that we can look forward in the not too distant future to a reestablishment of industrial activity in this country. But there are some manufacturers who, owing to their inability to secure credit, will fall by the wayside unless support is given them.

I wish to compliment you on the manner in which you presented this subject as well as the interest you are taking in returning men to employment.

And in another letter Mr. Fredrick says:

Referring further to your proposed financing, through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, of the industries of the country, advise that I was in conversation with Mr. Arnett, managing director of the Indiana State Chamber of Commerce, in regard to this, and I understand that he is sending you the names of such concerns that need such help. No doubt there are great numbers of them in the country that should receive assistance from the Government.

The Civil Works program cannot be stopped without serious results unless the labor engaged in this work now is absorbed through the ordinary channels of industrial activity. It is certainly wise that we should promote such a program that will absorb this labor. The depression that we have gone through has crippled many of our industries, and they need cash for working capital. Many of them are running half time today because of the need of additional capital. These loans should, of course, be thoroughly dependable and the security should be the best, but I know of nothing that would probably contribute more to an advancing employment and ultimately removing the C.W.A. employment than such a program.

MR. FARLEY FAVORS DIRECT LOANS

There is no more capable business man in the membership of this national law-making body than my colleague from Indiana, whom I am proud to call my friend, Hon. JAMES I. FARLEY, an able member of the Committee on Banking and Currency. Mr. FARLEY formerly was president of the Auburn

Automobile Co. He is a man trained in large business affairs, a wise adviser and safe counselor. Mr. FARLEY is a staunch advocate of the principle of direct loans to industry.

I believe that my bill, or one like it, must be passed before there ever will be a recovery in this Nation that will absorb into employment the multitudes now engaged in Civil Works Administration activities, and I appeal to Members of Congress to give this matter their thoughtful consideration to the end that by the time the additional Civil Works appropriation expires there may be a general transfer of men from the Civil Works rolls to the rolls of regular employment. The problem of what will come after Civil Works will soon be pressing and serious. We should have the vision to foresee it and to take steps in advance to bridge over the gap between synthetic employment and regular jobs. If we do not make such provision there will be a demand for the continuance of Civil Works to proportions that will bankrupt the Treasury and involve the taxpayers with unbelievable burdens.

Mr. SANDLIN. 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. GREGORY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 8134) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1935, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

VETERANS' REGULATIONS (H.DOC. NO. 266)

The Speaker laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Expenditures, and ordered printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of section 20, title 1, of the act entitled "An act to maintain the credit of the United States Government", approved March 20, 1933, I am transmitting herewith certified copies of Executive Order No. 6606 (Veterans' Regulation No. 2 (c)), approved by me on February 17, 1934.

This veterans' regulation amended Veterans' Regulation No. 2 (a) approved by me on July 28, 1933, and was issued in accordance with the terms of title I, Public, No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, "An act to maintain the credit of the United States Government."

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 26, 1934.

ADMINISTRATION OF NATIONAL CEMETERIES IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES (H.DOC. NO. 265)

The Speaker laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Expenditures and ordered printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of section 1, title III, of the act entitled "An act to maintain the credit of the United States Government", approved March 20, 1933, I am transmitting herewith an Executive order revoking so much of section 2 of Executive Order No. 6166 of June 10, 1933, heretofore transmitted to the Congress, as provided for the transfer to the Department of State of the administration of national cemeteries located in foreign countries, and transferring to the American Battle Monuments Commission the administration of the national cemeteries and memorials located in Europe.

This order leaves with the War Department the administration of one national cemetery located in a foreign country, namely, the national cemetery located in Mexico.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 26, 1934.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION (S.DOC. NO. 144)

The Speaker laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered printed.

To the Congress:

I have long felt that for the sake of clarity and effectiveness the relationship of the Federal Government to certain services known as utilities should be divided into three fields—transportation, power, and communications. The problems of transportation are vested in the Interstate Commerce Commission, and the problems of power, its development, transmission, and distribution, in the Federal Power Commission.

In the field of communications, however, there is today no single government agency charged with broad authority.

The Congress has vested certain authority over certain forms of communications in the Interstate Commerce Commission and there is in addition the agency known as the Federal Radio Commission. I recommend that the Congress create a new agency to be known as the Federal Communications Commission, such agency to be vested with the authority now lying in the Federal Radio Commission and with such authority over communications as now lies with the Interstate Commerce Commission—the services affected to be all of those which rely on wires, cables, or radio as a medium of transmission.

It is my thought that a new commission such as I suggest might well be organized this year by transferring the present authority for the control of communications of the Radio Commission and the Interstate Commerce Commission. The new body should, in addition, be given full power to investigate and study the business of existing companies and make recommendations to the Congress for additional legislation at the next session.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 26, 1934.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. WILSON, indefinitely, on account of illness.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. PARSONS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 6574. An act to repeal Federal liquor prohibition laws to the extent they are in force in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 6951. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1935, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled joint resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S.J.Res. 80. Joint resolution authorizing the President to invite the States of the Union and foreign countries to participate in the International Petroleum Exposition at Tulsa, Okla., to be held May 12 to May 19, 1934, inclusive.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. PARSONS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 6574. An act to repeal Federal liquor prohibition laws to the extent they are in force in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 6951. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1935, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SANDLIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 27, 1934, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE, RADIO, AND FISHERIES

(Tuesday, Feb. 27, 10 a.m.)

Hearings on House bills 7147, 7148, and 7149, in the committee room.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

(Tuesday, Feb. 27, 10 a.m.)

Continue hearings on the Federal aid to education bill, in the Conference Room, House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

(Tuesday, Feb. 27, 10 a.m.)

Continuation of the hearing on H.R. 7852, the National Securities Exchange Act of 1934.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. OLIVER of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H.J.Res. 10. Joint resolution requesting the President to proclaim October 12 as Columbus Day for the observance of the anniversary of the discovery of America; with amendment (Rept. No. 848). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. KLEBERG: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 7672. A bill to promote the conservation of wild life, fish, and game, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 850). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. KLEBERG: Committee on Agriculture. S. 2277. An act to establish fish and game sanctuaries in the national forests; without amendment (Rept. No. 851). 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. BLACK: Committee on Claims. S. 489. An act for the relief of the J. M. Dooley Fireproof Warehouse Corporation, of Brooklyn, N.Y.; without amendment (Rept. No. 849). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, the Committee on Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8217) granting a pension to Irene H. Holbrook, and the same was referred to the Committee on the Civil Service.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CROWE: A bill (H.R. 8278) to allocate the sum of \$50,000,000 out of any sums appropriated to carry out the National Industrial Recovery Act, for expenditure in the continuation of the Federal building program in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WADSWORTH: A bill (H.R. 8279) to authorize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make loans to facilitate the repair and renovation of buildings; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CUMMINGS: A bill (H.R. 8280) to amend section 36 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act to include companies and corporations organized for the purpose of distributing water to be used for irrigation purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. JENCKES of Indiana: A bill (H.R. 8281) to amend the act entitled "An act providing for the removal

of snow and ice from the paved sidewalks of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KELLY of Illinois: A bill (H.R. 8282) to limit the working hours of all persons working on dredges or tugs on the Great Lakes to 8 hours a day, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine, Radio, and Fisheries.

By Mr. DISNEY: A bill (H.R. 8283) to amend Public Law No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, entitled "An act to maintain the credit of the United States Government"; and Public Law No. 78, Seventy-third Congress, entitled "An act making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1934, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

Also, a bill (H.R. 8284) to carry out certain obligations under certain tribal agreements; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. McCLINTIC: A bill (H.R. 8285) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey the lands and property formerly used for the United States Indian School at Colony, Okla., to the Union Graded School District No. 1, of Colony, Okla.; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. WEIDEMAN: A bill (H.R. 8286) to authorize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make loans direct to municipalities and other governmental subdivisions organized pursuant to State law; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BEITER: A bill (H.R. 8287) to limit the exemption from duty of certain articles imported by residents who have not been abroad 15 days or more; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PETERSON: A bill (H.R. 8288) to extend to the sea-food, sponge, or other marine-products industry all benefits, privileges, aids, loans, or other advantages provided in laws enacted by Congress for the relief of persons engaged in the agricultural industry; to the Committee on Merchant Marine, Radio, and Fisheries.

By Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma: A bill (H.R. 8289) to provide Federal aid for public schools, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. McSWAIN: Resolution (H.Res. 284) relative to the expenses of conducting the investigation authorized and directed by House Resolution 275; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. McLEOD: Resolution (H.Res. 285) to investigate the condition of planes, equipment, and training facilities of the United States Army Air Corps; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DISNEY: Joint resolution (H.J.Res. 284) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BRUNNER (by request): A bill (H.R. 8290) for the relief of Steven Bodnar; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT: A bill (H.R. 8291) for the relief of Randall Corning Clapp; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. GIFFORD: A bill (H.R. 8292) for the relief of Henry Warner Lewis; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HEALEY: A bill (H.R. 8293) for the relief of Albert Henry George; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HIGGINS: A bill (H.R. 8294) for the relief of James S. Cuff; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. KELLY of Illinois: A bill (H.R. 8295) for the relief of James McHugh Sons, Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LOZIER: A bill (H.R. 8296) granting a pension to Mattie Mayo; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. O'BRIEN: A bill (H.R. 8297) for the relief of the Manufacturers' Equipment Co., of Chicago, Ill.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. REECE: A bill (H.R. 8298) for the relief of Charles Young; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ROMJUE: A bill (H.R. 8299) for the relief of Dr. J. S. Gashwiler; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia: A bill (H.R. 8300) for the relief of Cornelia Claiborne; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2559. By Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT: Petition of the executive committee, Oil Producers Sales Agency of California, urging elimination of Federal gasoline taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2560. Also, petition of the Gold Mining Association of America, through its secretary, Mr. J. C. KempVanEe, opposing provisions of House bill 2835, creating grazing districts within the several public-land States, etc.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

2561. Also, petition of Sam H. Green, California Dairy Council, San Francisco, Calif., protesting excise tax on coconut oil and other oriental oils used in the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2562. By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas: Resolution of the Madisonville Chamber of Commerce, Madisonville, Tex., urging liberal appropriation for public-highway construction; to the Committee on Roads.

2563. By Mr. KVALE: Petition of members of the Judson Memorial Baptist Church of Minneapolis, Minn., protesting against the increasing of armaments; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

2564. Also, petition of members of the Mayflower Community Church of Minneapolis, Minn., protesting against the increasing of armaments; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

2565. Also, petition of Waverly Farmers' Union, Truman, Minn., urging passage of the Frazier bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2566. Also, resolution of the Farmer-Labor Club, Canby, Minn., urging passage of the Frazier-Lemke, Swank-Thomas, Patman, and Wheeler bills; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2567. Also, memorial of the Independent Union of All Workers, Albert Lea, Minn., urging passage of the Frazier bill; to the committee on Banking and Currency.

2568. Also, petition of members of the Civilian Conservation Corps, company 1785 (veterans), Grand Marais, Minn., urging immediate payment of the bonus; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2569. Also, petition of members of the Powderhorn Park Baptist Church, of Minneapolis, Minn., protesting against the increasing of armaments; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

2570. By Mr. LAMBERTSON: Petition of Dr. Anna M. Foy and 38 other citizens, Dr. Estelle Porter and 33 other citizens, and Neva Darling and 19 other citizens, all of Topeka, Kans., opposing the passage of the Copeland bills, S. 2000 and S. 2355; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2571. Also, petition of A. W. Jones and 41 other citizens of Marshall County, Kans., urging the passage of the Frazier bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2572. Also, petition of the socialists of the St. John's School of Nursing of Leavenworth, Kans., opposing passage of House bill 5978; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2573. By Mr. PARKER: Petition of L. B. Bradley and 175 other citizens of Evans County, Ga., urging the passage of legislation providing for old-age pension; to the Committee on Pensions.

2574. By Mr. RICH: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of South Williamsport, Pa., favoring House bill 6097; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2575. By Mr. ROMJUE: Petition of the Kirksville (Mo.), Building and Loan Association, by C. H. Sanders, secretary, asking that the same provision be given the depositors in thrift and home-financing institutions, as is now given

depositors in commercial banks; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2576. Also, petition of the Ladies Auxiliary to the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, Victory Lodge, No. 28, St. Louis, Mo., favoring certain pending legislation; to the Committee on Labor.

2577. By Mr. SEGER: Petition of the Clifton City Council of Clifton, N.J., endorsing House bill 7598, known as the "Lundeen Workers Unemployment and Social Service Bill"; to the Committee on Labor.

2578. By Mr. SHALLENBERGER: Petition of James Pearson and 12,797 others of Shenandoah, Iowa; to the Committee on Merchant Marine, Radio, and Fisheries.

SENATE

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 1934

(Legislative day of Tuesday, Feb. 20, 1934)

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

THE JOURNAL

On motion of Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal for the calendar days of February 22 and February 26 was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled joint resolution (S.J.Res. 80) authorizing the President to invite the States of the Union and foreign countries to participate in the International Petroleum Exposition at Tulsa, Okla., to be held May 12 to May 19, 1934, inclusive, and it was signed by the Vice President.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Adams	Costigan	Kean	Reynolds
Ashurst	Cutting	Keyes	Robinson, Ark.
Austin	Davis	King	Robinson, Ind.
Bachman	Dickinson	La Follette	Russell
Bailey	Dieterich	Lewis	Schall
Bankhead	Dill	Logan	Sheppard
Barbour	Duffy	Loneragan	Shipstead
Barkley	Erickson	Long	Smith
Black	Fess	McAdoo	Steiwer
Bone	Fletcher	McCarran	Stephens
Borah	Frazier	McGill	Thomas, Okla.
Brown	George	McKellar	Thomas, Utah
Bulkley	Gibson	McNary	Thompson
Bulow	Goldsborough	Metcalf	Trammell
Byrd	Gore	Murphy	Tydings
Byrnes	Hale	Neely	Vandenberg
Capper	Harrison	Norris	Van Nuys
Caraway	Hastings	Nye	Wagner
Carey	Hatch	O'Mahoney	Walcott
Clark	Hatfield	Overton	Walsh
Connally	Hayden	Patterson	Wheeler
Coolidge	Hebert	Pittman	White
Copeland	Johnson	Pope	

Mr. HEBERT. I desire to announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED] is absent on account of illness, and that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. NORBECK] and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. TOWNSEND] are necessarily detained from the Senate.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I desire to announce the absence of my colleague the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. COUZENS] on account of illness. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I desire to announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is unavoidably absent from the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Ninety-one Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

REPORT OF BELLEAU WOOD MEMORIAL ASSOCIATION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the honorary president of the Belleau Wood Memorial

Association transmitting, pursuant to law, the statement of receipts and expenditures of the association for the year ended December 31, 1933, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a paper in the form of a petition from Charles Forney, of Princess Anne County, Va., relative to the so-called "Fletcher-Rayburn bill" for the regulation of stock exchanges, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

He also laid before the Senate a resolution of Local Union No. 3830, United Mine Workers of America, of Winton, Wyo., favoring the passage of the so-called "Wagner-Lewis bill" providing for unemployment insurance, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also laid before the Senate the petition of Edward X. Foster, of Duquesne, Pa., praying for the adoption of immigration measures looking toward the benefit of American actors and actresses rather than for the benefit of foreign talent in America, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. BARBOUR presented a resolution adopted by the council of Clifton City, N.J., favoring the passage of House bill 7598, known as the "Lundeen unemployment and social insurance bill", which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. TYDINGS presented resolutions adopted by B'nai B'rith Lodge No. 915, of Camden, and United Juniors of the Brotherhood of Bickur Cholim, of Jersey City, both in the State of New Jersey; and B'nai B'rith Lodge and the Ladies Auxiliary of that lodge, of Cheyenne, Wyo., favoring the passage of Senate Resolution 154 (submitted by Mr. TYDINGS), opposing alleged discriminations against Jews in Germany, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented petitions of several citizens of Cleveland, Ohio, praying for the adoption of a Senate resolution opposing alleged discriminations against Jews in Germany, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. CAPPER presented resolutions adopted by the Wilson County (Kans.) Bankers' Association, favoring the prompt passage of legislation to discontinue the Postal Savings System, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented memorials, numerously signed, of sundry citizens of Belleville, Buhler, Hesston, Hutchinson, Kingman, Naraka, Newton, Republic, Scandia, and Turon, all in the State of Kansas, remonstrating against the passage of the so-called "Tugwell bill", to prevent the manufacture, shipment, or sale of adulterated or misbranded foods and drugs and to prevent the false advertisement of such commodities, which were referred to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. THOMAS of Utah, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H.R. 715) to award the Distinguished Service Cross to former holders of the certificate of merit, and for other purposes, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 366) thereon.

Mr. PATTERSON, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 521) for the relief of Henry Poole, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 367) thereon.

Mr. CAREY, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H.R. 2509) for the relief of John Newman, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 368) thereon.

Mr. REYNOLDS, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill (S. 2089) to amend the Code of Laws for the District of Columbia, approved March 3, 1901, as amended (D.C. Code, title 5, ch. 3), relating to building and loan associations, reported it without amendment.

Mr. STEIWER, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 2860) to amend Public