

Law  
J  
11  
RS  
COPY 2

# Congressional Record

## SEVENTY-THIRD CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

### SENATE

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 18, 1934

(Legislative day of Tuesday, Apr. 17, 1934)

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

#### THE JOURNAL

On motion of Mr. HARRISON, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day of April 17 was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

#### EAST BAY MUNICIPAL UTILITY DISTRICT, CALIFORNIA

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2084) granting and confirming to the East Bay Municipal Utility District, a municipal utility district of the State of California and a body corporate and politic of said State, and a political subdivision thereof, certain lands, and for other purposes, which were to strike out all of section 2; on page 4, line 20, to strike out "3" and insert "2"; and on page 4, line 24, to strike out "4" and insert "3."

Mr. JOHNSON. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

#### FEES IN NATURALIZATION PROCEEDINGS—REENROLLMENT OF BILL

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution from the House of Representatives (H.Con. Res. 36), which was read, as follows:

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring).* That the action of the Vice President and of the Speaker of the House of Representatives in signing the enrolled bill (H.R. 3521) entitled "An act to reduce certain fees in naturalization proceedings, and for other purposes", be rescinded, and that in the reenrollment of such bill section 2 be stricken out and the clerk shall insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Sec. 2. Subdivisions (b) and (c) of section 32 of the act of June 29, 1906, and subdivision (a) of section 33 of the act of June 29, 1906, which were added thereto by section 9 of the act of March 2, 1929 (45 Stat. 1512) and by section 4 of the act of May 25, 1932 (47 Stat. 165), as amended (U.S.C., supp. VII, title 8, sec. 399 b (b) and (c), and sec. 399 c (a)), are amended as follows: Wherever in said subdivisions the words 'a fee of \$10' occur that shall be amended to read 'a fee of \$5.'"

Mr. COOLIDGE. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution and move its adoption.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was considered and agreed to.

#### INCLUSION OF SUGAR BEETS AND CANE AS BASIC COMMODITIES

Mr. HARRISON. I ask unanimous consent that the pending bill be temporarily laid aside, and that the so-called "sugar bill" be taken up for consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8861) to include sugar beets and sugar cane as basic agricultural commodities under the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance with amendments.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to state the first amendment reported by the committee.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, before the Senate proceeds to consider the amendments to the bill, I am wondering if the Senator from Colorado [Mr. COSTIGAN] or the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] intends to make a general statement respecting the measure.

Mr. HARRISON. I think the Senator from Colorado intends to make a general statement, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Clerk will call the roll.

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

Adams	Copeland	Hebert	Pope
Ashurst	Costigan	Johnson	Reed
Austin	Couzens	Kean	Reynolds
Bachman	Cutting	Keyes	Robinson, Ind.
Bailey	Dickinson	King	Russell
Bankhead	Dieterich	Lewis	Schall
Barbour	Dill	Logan	Sheppard
Barkley	Duffy	Loneragan	Shipstead
Black	Erickson	Long	Steiwer
Bone	Fess	McCarran	Stephens
Borah	Fletcher	McGill	Thomas, Okla.
Brown	Frazier	McKellar	Thomas, Utah
Bulkley	George	McNary	Thompson
Bulow	Gibson	Metcalf	Townsend
Byrd	Glass	Murphy	Vandenberg
Byrnes	Goldsborough	Neely	Van Nuys
Capper	Gore	Norris	Wagner
Caraway	Hale	Nye	Walcott
Carey	Harrison	O'Mahoney	Walsh
Clark	Hastings	Overton	White
Connally	Hatch	Petterson	
Coolidge	Hayden	Pittman	

Mr. LEWIS. I desire to announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] is detained from the Senate by reason of a death in his family.

I desire further to announce that the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] is absent on account of illness, and that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from California [Mr. McADOO], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. TRAMMELL] are necessarily detained from the Senate.

Mr. HEBERT. I announce the necessary absence of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. HATFIELD].

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

Mr. COSTIGAN gained the floor.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I am astonished to find that before the roll was called and before the presence of a quorum was established, the so-called "sugar bill" was taken up and made the order for today. I intimated yesterday in what I stated that there were certain amendments I wished to prepare for presentation to the Senate. I will be ready, so far as I am concerned, to go on with this bill tomorrow, but I am not ready today. I do not think it was fair, Mr. President, that the measure was made the order for today, in the absence of the establishment of the presence of a quorum this morning.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. Yesterday I opposed the consideration and discussion of the bill because it collided with the rule requir-

ing that a bill shall lie over for 1 day after having been reported. However, at that time I specifically stated I would have no objection to its consideration today. I do not know whether the Senator from New York was on the floor or not at that time.

I will add further, if I may, that the substitution of the so-called "sugar bill" for the pending unfinished business was made before I reached the Chamber this morning, and it was done before the roll was called; but, anyway, so far as I am concerned, I think those on this side are willing to proceed today in view of the statement made yesterday by me on the floor.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I yield.

Mr. BORAH. There is going to be considerable general discussion of the bill before we take up amendments. Could not that discussion proceed today?

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President—

Mr. COSTIGAN. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. COPELAND. I cannot do other than yield to what has happened, but I am frank to say I think it was utterly unfair to present the matter in this way. I do not know how many Senators were on the floor; I suppose not more than half a dozen. A quorum had not yet been called. It was not a fair procedure at all. The bill ought to go over until tomorrow out of courtesy to those of us who have been working practically all night trying to perfect amendments which we desire to present to the bill.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I yield.

Mr. HARRISON. If there is any blame to be attached for bringing the measure before the Senate the first thing this morning, I will assume the blame. The bill has been on the program of business for some time. When the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] left the city he understood the bill was to be brought before the Senate as soon as it was reported from the committee.

I have no interest in the world in the sugar bill. My State is not particularly interested in it. I have given some 2 or 3 months of very strenuous effort to adjusting differences with reference to the matter, and the result was not accomplished without some difficulty. We finally got together on a bill which, in my opinion, is an excellent measure. It has been known that the bill was to come before the Senate at the earliest possible moment. Yesterday there was an effort made to obtain unanimous consent to have it considered. The reasons advanced were that contracts are now being made in the sugar-beet region with the sugar planters and others interested, and unless the bill shall be passed and those contracts made at a very early date, the growers will lose whatever benefits might accrue to them by virtue of the enactment of the legislation. I thought everyone interested understood that we were going to take up the bill and have it considered today.

No one wants to do the Senator from New York any injustice. There is nothing unfair in what we are trying to do with reference to sugar legislation. If some reason is advanced for delay and it is agreeable to the Senate to postpone consideration of the measure until tomorrow, with the idea of then passing it, that would be perfectly agreeable to me; but it does seem to me that a bill of this importance ought to be considered by the Senate and disposed of in view of the circumstances. That is the reason for bringing up the matter this morning. I thought everyone had notice yesterday that the bill would be brought up this morning for consideration.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I do not want the Senator from Mississippi to rest under any charge of bad faith in connec-

tion with the matter. If there were any bad faith involved—and certainly there was none—it would be just as much my fault as his; but I cannot concede that any such thing exists. When the Vice President called the Senate to order this morning, the Senator from Mississippi and I discussed the sugar-bill status. In view of the announcement made last night just before adjournment, when the Senator from Mississippi directly stated to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. FESS] that it was his purpose to ask for this substitution the first thing this morning, it seemed to me the Senator from Mississippi was entirely within his rights and entirely within the notice that had been given the Senate to ask the substitution which he did in the order of business. So far as I am concerned, representing, perhaps, as hostile a feeling respecting the bill as there is in the Senate, I was very glad to agree. I think I owe that statement in fairness to the Senator from Mississippi. He has been so continuously fair to all of us throughout these long and perplexed considerations of the sugar problem that he deserves this testimony.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I wish to say that while I was not here when the agreement was made temporarily to lay aside the unfinished business this morning, still it was understood yesterday afternoon between the Senator from Mississippi and myself that that was to be done. I felt that I should say this much to the Senate. The Senator from Mississippi has not been guilty of any bad faith, in my judgment.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. FESS. I want to say to my friend the Senator from New York [Mr. COPELAND] that last evening I had the floor intending to enter into a discussion of the air mail bill, when the Senator from Mississippi spoke to me about the plan that had been suggested. I stated at the time that I was somewhat embarrassed in that Senators with whom I usually consult were not at the moment present, but I was informed at once that the matter had been discussed with them, so it was understood that the sugar bill would be taken up this morning and, although I had the floor and intended to continue with the discussion of the air-mail measure today, I gave way with that understanding.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I yield.

Mr. COPELAND. There used to be in the Senate what we call "senatorial courtesy." I trust that state of mind still occupies the hearts and brains of Senators. I invite attention to the RECORD. Yesterday when the matter was brought up I interposed an objection and said:

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, my reason for interposing at all was because of my desire to have the measure go over for a day, at least, until material which has been sent to me shall have arrived. I think perhaps there is considerable interest in the bill in my State.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Will 24 hours suffice?

Mr. COPELAND. I cannot answer at the moment. I want first to see what the material is.

That is the RECORD. Now, I contend, Mr. President, that it is utterly unfair, in the presence of 8 or 10 or possibly a dozen Members of the Senate, contrary to the usual practice of the Senate and before the roll has been called to bring in a quorum, that the sugar bill should be made the order of the day in the absence of the establishment of a quorum. The Senate may do as it pleases, but I contend that it is unfair.

I offered no objection to the early consideration of the bill. I made clear why I wished the delay, in order that certain material might be had. It came to me. I have been working on it for hours. I am almost ready to present my amendments, but I come here today and find that in the absence of what I thought was an understanding yester-

day, the bill has been made the order of business for the day. I repeat, Mr. President, that I do not think it is in accord with the courtesy which is usually extended to Senators and which has been the rule of courtesy in this body from time without end.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield further to me?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I merely wish to call attention to what occurred on the floor of the Senate yesterday afternoon, as follows:

Mr. HARRISON. I do not want to interfere with the Senator's speech.

He was speaking of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. FESS].

I merely wish to state that it is desired, when we conclude our session this afternoon, to recess until 12 o'clock tomorrow, and at that time to have the pending bill temporarily laid aside and the sugar bill brought before the Senate. It is hoped that we can get through with the sugar bill very speedily. In view of that fact I thought, perhaps, the Senator might not want to have his speech interrupted by beginning this afternoon and then delaying its completion until we pass the sugar bill and get back to the air mail bill. Would the Senator prefer to wait until we dispose of the sugar bill or to proceed this afternoon?

Mr. FESS. It is understood that we are to recess quite early and to meet tomorrow at 12 o'clock. The Senator knows how anxious a Senator, who plans to speak, is to follow an argument that has just been made; but if it is understood that the sugar bill will be taken up tomorrow, I shall be very glad to accommodate the Senator and to defer my address until the Senate shall resume the consideration of the air mail bill.

Mr. HARRISON. I should not make even the suggestion to the Senator if it were not for the fact that Senators who represent sugar-beet regions are very anxious to secure action on this proposed legislation so that the farmers may make their contract with reference to this year's yield.

Those are the facts that came out on the floor of the Senate yesterday afternoon, and I feel that they ought to be recited here this morning.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I yield.

Mr. NORRIS. As one of the Senators particularly interested in the sugar bill and as one who understood yesterday, even at the time we were voting to displace the unfinished business, that if the air mail bill were taken up it would be laid aside today and the sugar bill taken up, I want to say that I supposed that understanding was universal and that everyone in the Senate understood it. I assumed that the Senator from Mississippi believed that to be the fact when he submitted his request this morning.

I was present when he submitted his request to lay aside temporarily the unfinished business and take up the sugar bill, and I assumed that the Senator from Mississippi was acting in good faith. I have no doubt that he was. With the understanding which I believe prevailed among Senators, I think he was justified in making the request. I realize, however, that probably the Senator from New York did not hear it. I realize, too, that when the Senator from Mississippi made the request he made it before a point of no quorum was made and before the roll was called, and undoubtedly at a time when there was not a quorum of the Senate present.

It seemed to me the step was a proper one for the Senator from Mississippi to take under all the circumstances and in view of the understanding, but we ought not to have a misunderstanding on the subject. I can see how the Senator from New York may not have been present when the various discussions took place, and even though I am particularly anxious that the bill be taken up and disposed of as soon as possible I do not want to do it with any cloud of misunderstanding or discourtesy existing.

While I think the Senator from Mississippi was justified in the position he took, I believe, as one who desires to see the bill acted on, that we will get action quicker if we concede that the Senator from New York had a different understanding from the other Senators, and that the Senator from Mississippi should make his request now. If it should

not be agreed to, I believe he would be justified in making a motion to take up the bill.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I was about to make a statement, in view of what the Senator from New York has just stated.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield for just a moment?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I do.

Mr. McNARY. I do not feel any responsibility in this situation, because of the statement I made yesterday; but let me remind the Senator from New York that he is not without a remedy. If he should ask for the regular order the unfinished business, which is the air mail bill, would come back before the Senate. If the Senator desires to exercise that right, it is fully within his power to do so.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield to me?

Mr. HARRISON. I should like to make a statement.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I yield first to the Senator from Mississippi. I will yield later to the Senator from New York.

Mr. HARRISON. There is no reason for anyone to think there is any misunderstanding about this matter. I think Senators generally agree, in view of what has happened upon the floor today, that everyone thought the sugar bill was coming up this morning.

I would not do the Senator from New York an injustice for anything in the world, and I would not be discourteous to him. In view of the fact that we did ask unanimous consent to take up the bill this morning, and it is here before us, if the Senator from New York thinks some injustice has been done to him and he would prefer to have the bill laid over for a while, I shall be very glad to ask unanimous consent to undo what we have done, and to take up the measure later. I do not want to proceed with the Senator thinking that any sharp practice has been indulged in in this connection, for the fact is that we were proceeding in a very orderly way this morning, in view of what happened yesterday.

So if the Senator from New York has not yet had an opportunity to prepare his amendments, and prefers to have us wait for a few hours before taking up the bill, we can do so. If he would rather have us take it up in the morning, I shall try to get unanimous consent to have that done. I cannot do any more than that.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

Mr. COSTIGAN. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. BORAH. Would not the Senator from New York be able to protect his situation entirely if we should go ahead with the general discussion of the bill which is inevitably going to take place?

The Senator from New York understands that the situation in the West is such that a delay of 1 or 2 days may mean a vast amount of injury to those people. I should like to see some changes in this bill; but I recognize that some bill on the subject must be passed, if we are going to pass it at all; at once, if it is to have any beneficial effect whatever on the interests of the growers. Several speeches are to be made before we take up amendments. Would it not be possible to proceed in that way rather than to lay the bill aside for a day?

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Before I yield to the Senator from New York, in view of the possibility that this discussion may suddenly terminate, I desire to say that the record before us is so clear, and the reputation, services, and attitude of the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] throughout the difficult days of discussion of this measure have been such that I have been intending to preface any remarks I might make today with a tribute to the exceptional ability, disinterestedness, and integrity shown by the Senator from Mississippi.

Of course, I join other Senators in every disposition to show proper courtesy, at this time or on any other occasion, to the Senator from New York and every other Member of this body.

I now yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I have been in the Senate a long while, and on many occasions have been interfered with because I tried to be polite. Many times aggressive Senators have taken the floor from more modest ones, regardless of recognition from the Chair. I have always tried to conform to the rules. I have tried to observe the old-time courtesy of the Senate.

Mr. President, I was not in the Senate Chamber yesterday afternoon, but I was not at a ball game or engaged in some sort of personal activity. I was in my office in a conference over the War Department bill with officials of the Department. I was not here when the later conversation took place in the Senate. When I said in the afternoon that I was not yet ready to go forward, I had a right to think that that intimation would be sufficient.

The Senate may do as it please in this respect. I am not going to make any further suggestion or make any request. The Senator from Mississippi knows whether or not I have had a square deal in the matter. It is for him to decide whether or not he shall ask for unanimous consent. It is not for me to request it. The Senator from Mississippi must do as his sense of propriety dictates, now and always.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Certainly.

Mr. HARRISON. I desire to say to the Senator from New York that I do not know anything else I can do. I have told the Senator from New York that if it would meet his convenience I would ask for unanimous consent to lay the bill aside for 2 or 3 hours and take it up later, or I would ask to have it taken up tomorrow morning if that would meet with the approval of the Senate. I am just waiting for a suggestion. Otherwise, of course, we should have to proceed with the consideration of the bill.

I desire to show every courtesy to the Senator. I want him to have an opportunity to offer his amendments and let the Senate vote on them. I do not know anything more that I can do.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—

Mr. COSTIGAN. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. I should like to submit a proposal for the consideration of the Senator from New York.

First, as has already been stated by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], in this particular case time is the essence of the whole matter. Sugar beets are being planted right now. Many of them have been planted. Contracts have not been entered into. Thousands of people are dependent upon the action of Congress on this legislation; and unless Congress acts at once they are liable to have their entire year's efforts come to naught.

I desire to ask the Senator from New York whether it would not be satisfactory to him if we should go on with the debate, and let those who have speeches to make—and there are quite a number of them, I understand, on both sides of the subject—make their speeches, and get that much nearer to the goal, with the understanding that we shall not take up amendments until tomorrow, if the Senator wants to go that far, and that we shall not vote on the passage of the bill until tomorrow, and thus expedite the matter.

These speeches will have to be made anyway. They are going to take considerable time. I am not one among the Senators who are going to make speeches. I am not pleading for myself, but I am pleading that the consideration of the measure be hastened, and that if we finish with the speeches today and are ready to take up the bill for amendment we lay it aside until tomorrow, in order that the Senator from New York may have ample time to devote the day to the preparation of his amendments if he so desires.

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

Mr. COSTIGAN. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. I have previously sent to the desk a resolution, which I ask to have read at this time, if there be no objection. It covers only a couple of pages. It is lying on the desk, in my handwriting.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, let us dispose of this matter.

Mr. LONG. I thought perhaps a little levity might help us get together on it.

Mr. BORAH. There may be levity in the Chamber, but there is not levity out in the beet fields.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. COPELAND. I never have interfered with a Senator making a speech. If there are Senators here who are bubbling over with enthusiasm and desire to orate, I hope they will do it today.

I have no objection to the speeches. Indeed, I could do some work in committee while they are being made; but I do not want this bill read for amendment until I shall have had an opportunity to perfect the amendments which I wish to offer. I made that clear yesterday. I repeat it today.

Mr. President, far be it from me to interrupt the eloquence and the flow of oratory which may break forth when this bill becomes established as the order of the day; but I still contend that I have been the victim for years of continued efforts to be polite and to be courteous to my fellows. From this time on, however, I desire to say to my friend from Mississippi I am going to be just as mean as anybody. So far as the speeches are concerned, let them go on, and God bless the orators. [Laughter.]

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President I ask unanimous consent that we proceed with the discussion of this bill or any other matter that may come before the Senate today, and that tomorrow we take up the bill for amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, if the Senator from New York really would like to discontinue the discussion of the sugar bill until tomorrow I can relieve him, if I can secure the floor as soon as the Senator from Colorado yields it, because I will take the floor and occupy the remainder of the day on the subject of air mail.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Let the Chair state to the Senator from Ohio that a Senator on the Republican side, the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], has requested that he be recognized at the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from Colorado, and the Chair understands the Senator from Michigan is very much interested in the bill under consideration.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. The request made by the Senator from Mississippi is that the Senate proceed with the discussion of the bill and that we wait until tomorrow to vote on the bill or any amendments proposed. Has that request been acted on?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It has not been acted on. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Mississippi? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Mr. President, before the bill now before the Senate is given detailed consideration perhaps I should make a moderately short general statement about it.

No measure introduced at this session of Congress, when called up for consideration, has been so well understood as the present bill, alike with respect to its program, its objectives, and its specific provisions. Unfortunately prefaced and dramatized at hearings before the House Agricultural Committee by testimony which conveyed a wholly false impression of its scope and purposes, the bill for some weeks has been subjected to close scrutiny and, except for customary and natural differences of opinion on some of its details, has emerged with general and strong support and with a widespread demand for the promptest possible enactment into law. The urgency of the situation mentioned by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] must again be

stressed at the outset of this discussion, and it is only reasonable to ask that whatever action the Senate is to adopt be taken without delay. The planting season in the West is immediately at hand, and contracts between growers and processors are at this moment awaiting final action by Congress. The offices of Senators and Representatives from the various sugar-growing States are at this hour flooded with telegrams directing attention to the importance of instant and favorable action. A few of many of these messages were yesterday placed in the RECORD by me. One also was incorporated by the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. POPE].

It therefore is gratifying to realize that the bill, which passed the House of Representatives a few days ago, at last has apparently received, after extended discussion and debate, the approval of continental beet and cane growers. From the beginning I have had no doubt and have frequently stated that if the suggested legislation were understood, the administration's program would certainly receive general approval. It is not strange that the wisest of those who came to scoff have remained to praise.

Criticized by representatives of various special interests when first proposed as injurious to the sugar industry, the measure we are discussing is now recognized as that industry's immediate and surest safeguard. It presents for a long disorganized industry the most carefully considered and balanced example of sensible national planning to bring production and consumption within hailing distance of each other so far evolved, which the administration has attempted to apply to any basic agricultural commodity. Although the measure deals with nonsurplus domestic production, everyone familiar with the industry realizes that the problems under which the domestic sugar industry is laboring are those imposed by world surplus conditions which have so effectively operated under our single-track policy of relatively high and ever higher tariffs, that it at last has become necessary to raise statutory barriers of quota limitations against competitive forces which have been slowly strangling our continental-sugar development and the welfare of our beet and cane growers.

Fundamentally the measure before us is extremely simple. Its most essential provision will be found in its opening section, which adds sugar beets and sugarcane to basic agricultural commodities, thus preparing the way to the measure's first objective—the payment of benefits to sugar farmers out of processing taxes, so that they may secure living prices for their beets and cane. A second objective of the measure is the stabilization of markets and prices by quota limitations on production and imports, which, although differing in amounts allocated, does not depart in principle and merely modifies the stabilization and quota arrangement earnestly advocated last fall by all branches of the domestic sugar industry, including representatives of beet and cane growers.

The third and most unusual feature of the bill is to be found in the fact that it is so timed that it can take effect in conjunction with an expected reduction in the tariff, recommended under existing law by the United States Tariff Commission. As a consequence, and by the application of a processing tax identical in amount with the reduction of the tariff, it becomes possible to raise the required money for meeting benefit payments without adding to the burden of consumers, as has been done in the cases of processing taxes on other basic commodities. In other words, there should be no increase in the price of sugar to the public in this country as a result of the collection of funds out of which to make benefit payments for the extension of much-needed relief to beet and cane farmers. This does not mean, it should be clearly stated, that the price of sugar will not hereafter be different or increase under changed market and competitive conditions of supply and demand after this bill becomes law. It merely means that the approval of this bill and the imposition of processing taxes for which it provides, in view of the lowering of the tariff on sugar in exactly the same amount as the processing tax, which is to be added, should not increase the price to be paid by the sugar-consuming public.

Doubtless it is proper to preface the discussion of this bill with one further statement: A year ago the Senate did, and the Agriculture Department did not, favor, as provided in the pending bill, the inclusion of sugar beets and cane among basic agricultural commodities. Many of the Members of the Senate are to be congratulated today on their foresight in undertaking to do 12 months ago what the Department of Agriculture now recommends.

In January of this year the Secretary of Agriculture made the following statement on this subject:

When the Agricultural Adjustment Act was enacted farm prices of sugar beets and sugar cane were very close to their fair exchange value, and, as a consequence, sugar was not included as a basic agricultural commodity under the act. Anticipating market pressure as a result of the large prospective crop of 1933-34, however, the Agricultural Adjustment Administration negotiated with representatives of the industry to the end that a marketing agreement in the interest of cane- and beet-sugar producers might be consummated.

The draft of a marketing agreement which was finally presented for the approval of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration was, however, unsatisfactory, because it emphasized the interests of processors rather than the income of producers; because it did not provide for effective production control; and because the protection of consumers' interests was virtually confined to the Secretary's power to terminate the agreement.

The Secretary added:

After the disapproval of the marketing agreement, the administration explored various alternative procedures. Our ultimate conclusion was that, irrespective of action which might subsequently be taken with respect to market quotas, or the regulation of competition, we should be in a position to make supplementary payments to producers of beets and cane, and to limit acreage sown to these crops if and to the extent that such action appeared necessary for the effectuation for the purposes of the act.

Direct negotiations with producers will require that sugarcane and sugar beets be made basic agricultural commodities.

In connection with this statement of the Secretary of Agriculture it would appear desirable to include in these remarks, and have incorporated in the RECORD, one or two tables.

Mr. President, I first tender for the RECORD a table showing prices paid to sugar-beet farmers, contrasted in parallel columns with the fair-exchange value, of sugar beets. From this tabulation it appears that the growers of sugar beets in the United States between the years 1915 and 1924, both inclusive, received in only 4 years—1918, 1919, 1920, and 1923—the fair-exchange value or pre-war parity contemplated by the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and that during the years from 1925 to 1933, inclusive, in no year did sugar-beet farmers receive pre-war parity for their products.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TOWNSEND in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The table referred to is as follows:

Table showing prices paid to farmers and fair exchange value

Year	Price per ton paid to farmer	Index of farm purchasing power	Pre-war parity (fair exchange value)	Did farmer get parity?
1915	\$5.67	105	\$5.8485	Almost.
1916	6.12	124	6.9058	Almost.
1917	7.39	149	8.2993	No.
1918	10.00	175	9.7475	Yes (Government price fixing).
1919	11.74	200	11.1400	Yes.
1920	11.63	194	10.8058	Yes.
1921	6.35	150	8.3550	No.
1922	7.91	146	8.1322	Almost.
1923	8.99	149	8.2993	Yes.
1924	7.99	150	8.3550	Almost.
1925	6.39	154	8.5778	No.
1926	7.61	153	8.5221	No.
1927	7.67	151	8.4107	No.
1928	7.11	153	8.5221	No.
1929	7.03	152	8.4664	No.
1930	7.14	144	8.0208	No.
1931	5.94	124	6.9058	No.
1932	5.26	107	5.9599	No.
1933	5.32	109	6.0713	No.

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

Mr. COSTIGAN. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. If the statement just made by the Senator is correct, it is apparent that the Secretary of Agriculture

was in error in his statement when he said 1 year ago there was comparatively nothing wrong with the price.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The statement of the Secretary of Agriculture was that farm prices of sugar beets and sugarcane were very close to their fair exchange value. The table which has been prepared in the Department of Agriculture indicates that the average price paid to the farmer on the 1933 sugar-beet crop—that is, the 1932 crop, which was marketed in 1933—amounted to \$5.32 per ton, and pre-war parity at the time for sugar-beet growers would have been \$6.0713 per ton. Of course, at the time when the Secretary of Agriculture was considering this problem beet farmers had not finally been paid, so that in part the Secretary of Agriculture necessarily based his statement on estimates of amounts the companies would be required under their contracts to pay beet growers.

As most Members of the Senate are doubtless aware, trans-Mississippi farmers generally receive in payment for beets 50 percent of the net returns from beet sugar after deduction has been made by the sugar companies of expenses, including taxes, connected with the purchase of the beets and the manufacture and sale of the sugar.

As a matter of fact, predictions of the Secretary of Agriculture a year ago, as suggested by the able Senator from Nebraska, were not fulfilled; and without doubt that development contributed, with others, to the later recommendation by the Secretary of Agriculture that sugar beets and sugarcane be made basic agricultural commodities.

Mr. President, the United States Tariff Commission has recently made an examination of the cost of producing sugar beets in the various States of this country. I think, in connection with what has been said, that a table received from that Commission under date March 13, 1934, should also be incorporated in the RECORD.

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

Mr. COSTIGAN. I yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. May I ask the Senator if that report of the Tariff Commission is publicly available as yet?

Mr. COSTIGAN. It is my understanding that it has not been printed, but that it will be made available to the Senator from Michigan if he desires to see it.

For the information of the Senate, at this moment, perhaps, I should say that the costs of production shown in the

table which I am offering for the RECORD run from a low figure of \$4.69 in the State of Nebraska for the year 1931—a simple average being given—to a high figure of \$7.34 in the State of Utah.

For the year 1930 the low figure apparently is \$4.78 for the State of Kansas, and the high figure, \$7.51, in the State of Michigan.

I ask that this table from the United States Tariff Commission be printed in the RECORD.

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

The table referred to is as follows:

*Sugar beets, cost per ton, by States*

	Simple average <sup>1</sup>	
	1930	1931
<b>Nonirrigated:</b>		
Michigan.....	\$7.51	\$5.31
Wisconsin.....	7.35	5.37
Iowa.....	5.50	5.05
Minnesota.....	6.35	5.38
Average.....	6.39	5.40
<b>Irrigated:</b>		
Colorado.....	5.08	5.52
Nebraska.....	4.93	4.69
Wyoming.....	5.08	5.23
Utah.....	5.72	7.34
Idaho.....	5.90	6.32
Montana.....	5.38	5.03
Kansas.....	4.78	5.92
South Dakota.....	5.60	6.41
California.....	6.02	6.14
Average.....	5.27	5.67
All States.....	5.40	5.65

<sup>1</sup> Simple average of costs in representative areas.

U. S. Tariff Commission, Washington, D. C., Mar. 13, 1934.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Perhaps this table should be accompanied by a further table from the Tariff Commission of the same date showing the costs of production f.o.b. factory in irrigated areas and in nonirrigated areas, arranged by States, and weighted by individual factory production. I ask that the table be inserted in the RECORD.

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

The table referred to is as follows:

*Beet sugar: Cost of production f.o.b. factory, in irrigated areas and in nonirrigated areas, arranged by States and weighted by individual factory production, 1929-30*  
(Cents per pound of sugar)

	Cost of sugar beets <sup>1</sup>	Conversion cost <sup>2</sup>	Total cost f.o.b. factory	Bags of sugar produced	Tons of beets consumed	Pounds of sugar per ton of beets used	Number of factories used in each State
<b>Irrigated area:</b>							
Colorado.....	2.011	1.821	3.832	6,685,794	2,636,201	254	16
Nebraska.....	1.937	1.833	3.820	2,793,901	1,097,334	255	7
Kansas.....	1.980	3.904	5.884	121,118	50,163	241	1
Wyoming.....	1.773	2.080	3.853	1,318,808	461,180	286	4
Utah.....	2.033	2.427	4.460	1,539,446	544,973	282	10
Idaho.....	1.987	2.279	4.266	1,572,817	508,031	310	8
Montana.....	1.850	2.175	4.025	1,078,674	370,636	291	4
California.....	1.766	2.486	4.252	1,766,308	513,234	344	5
Weighted average cost, all irrigated areas.....	1.944	2.056	4.000	16,876,866	6,181,752	273	55
<b>Nonirrigated areas:</b>							
Michigan.....	2.524	2.799	5.323	516,819	173,362	298	5
Iowa.....	2.190	2.711	4.901	540,650	215,243	251	2
Minnesota.....	2.636	2.786	5.422	496,269	204,020	243	2
South Dakota.....	2.188	2.051	4.239	312,220	121,972	256	1
Wisconsin.....	2.592	4.287	6.879	42,764	15,083	284	1
Weighted average cost, all nonirrigated areas.....	2.405	2.682	5.087	1,908,722	729,680	262	11
Weighted average cost, all areas combined.....	1.991	2.121	4.112	18,785,588	6,911,432	272	66

<sup>1</sup> Based on 1930 farm cost of production.

<sup>2</sup> Includes freight and receiving expense on beets, manufacturing costs, administrative expenses, imputed interest, and credit for by-products and collateral operations, but does not include loading and reconditioning cost nor storage at distributing points.

U. S. Tariff Commission, Mar. 13, 1934.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, before the Senator leaves the last table, which like the other table has not yet been seen by the Senators—at least, I have not had access to it—I should like the Senator, in addition to having it printed

in the RECORD, to give us now a short synopsis of what is shown by the table.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Mr. President, the table I have offered deals with costs of production in the years 1929-30. It

shows lowest cost factory production in cents per pound for sugar in the States of Colorado and Nebraska; Colorado's cost, as estimated by the Tariff Commission, being 3.832 cents per pound; Nebraska's cost being 3.820 cents per pound.

The highest cost of sugar production for that year appears to have been in the State of Wisconsin, 6.879 cents per pound.

In the order of increasing costs between low and high we find: South Dakota, 4.239 cents per pound; Iowa, 4.901 cents per pound; Michigan, 5.323 cents per pound; Minnesota, 5.422 cents per pound; and Kansas, 5.884 cents per pound.

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

Mr. COSTIGAN. I yield.

Mr. NORRIS. I understood from what the Senator said when he offered the table that it would show the relative costs between irrigated and nonirrigated tracts of land.

Mr. COSTIGAN. That is true. The irrigated areas mentioned are in Colorado, Nebraska, Kansas, Wyoming, Utah, Idaho, Montana, and California.

The weighted average cost of sugar for all these States was 4 cents per pound. The nonirrigated areas are listed as Michigan, Iowa, Minnesota, South Dakota, and Wisconsin, with a weighted average factory cost of sugar for the nonirrigated States of 5.087 cents per pound. This table also gives the number of factories operated in each State and the pounds of sugar per ton of beets shown in the calculation of the United States Tariff Commission.

Mr. President, having pressed for the inclusion of sugar beets and sugar cane as basic commodities in April 1932 and again at the opening of the present session, no one here, I assume, has a more definite record than I have of legislative efforts to try to combine the principle of unrestricted production with bounty or benefit payments. It is fair to point out that the original proposal, which was limited to declaring sugar beets and cane basic commodities under the Agricultural Adjustment Act, had and still has the merit of putting no restrictions on domestic production and of leaving to the voluntary action of individual farmers the question whether they prefer to grow beets without reference to prices received for them or to reduce production in consideration of receiving bounty payments, assuring them the fair exchange or pre-war parity value of their beets.

Such a measure, although extremely simple in form, would have been helpful to the sugar farmers and to the business communities adjacent to their farms and homes during the past year. However, insistence on quota restrictions last fall by all branches of the sugar industry, including farmers, in a stabilization agreement had such evident merits, or, at least, possibilities, from the viewpoint of stabilizing production, and thereby prices, that it is only natural that this bill should include trial of the quota experiment, the merits of which can be tested during the coming months and can be further dealt with, if need arises, at a subsequent session of the Congress.

Mr. President, before proceeding, perhaps it is proper to ask an opportunity to place in the RECORD, following the tables which have been submitted, a statement prepared in the Department of Agriculture showing the basis on which the pre-war parity of sugar beets has been calculated by the Department.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The statement referred to is as follows:

It is estimated that the average price paid for beets for the 1933 crop will be approximately \$1.37 per ton below the fair exchange value as of December 20, 1933, the latest date for which farmers' cost-index numbers have been calculated.

The reasoning upon which this figure is based is outlined below:

The average price paid to farmers for sugar beets during the pre-war period August 1909-14 was \$5.57 per ton. The index number of the cost of commodities farmers buy, issued December 20, 1933, was 1.18. The fair exchange value for beets as of that date, therefore, becomes \$5.57 by 1.18, or \$6.57.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Does the statement presented by the Senator refer to the same relative parity as that mentioned by him a short time ago?

Mr. COSTIGAN. It does. It gives the formula under which the Department of Agriculture from time to time, under the terms of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, works out its calculation of the purchasing power of the farmer's product in terms of articles the farmer buys.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. May I impose upon the Senator's time for a moment to ask him what the figures were that he gave a short time ago to show how far the producer of sugar beets was from receiving parity upon his last year's crop?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The Senator realizes that the beet-sugar crop of 1933 is still being sold, so that we have not the final returns to beet farmers for the 1933-34 crop. We have the figures, however, for the 1932 crop of beets, the completion of the sale of sugar from which occurred in 1933.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Was that the crop to which the Senator's figures a short time ago referred, which showed that the farmer lacked about a dollar from receiving parity?

Mr. COSTIGAN. It was. The price received was \$5.32 per ton of beets, and pre-war parity would have been \$6.0713 per ton.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. That parity is figured on the formula furnished by the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and is based entirely upon the fair price level of what the farmers purchase.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Precisely.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. If the Senator will permit me, I should like to call something else to his attention. This winter when the Secretary of Agriculture was before the Agricultural Committee he admitted that that was an unfair formula; that there was a serious error in the Agricultural Adjustment Act, in that to give to the farmer parity on the basis of the commodities which he had to buy was not sufficient to afford him actual parity. It was admitted that in addition to that formula there should be added his increased payments of interest since the pre-war period, because he does not buy interest but pays interest; also his increased taxes should be figured, and his increased cost of labor.

Mr. COSTIGAN. In other words, if I understand the able Senator from Minnesota, the farmer's lot is worse than is disclosed by the figures I have cited.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. It is very much worse. The Department of Agriculture has since conducted a survey to find out how much farm prices would have to be raised in addition to that allowed by the present formula in order to give the farmer actual parity. Figuring in the other items that ought to be included in his cost of production, such as increased payment of interest on his increased indebtedness, his increase in taxes, and his increased labor cost, the Department has found that the farmer's parity price would be raised 13 percent over that allowed under the Agricultural Adjustment Act. So, on the basis of the figures the Senator has already given, the spread or lack of parity for sugar beets should be increased by about 98 cents; in other words, the farmer is lacking 98 cents more of being on a parity than according to the figures calculated under the formula of the Agricultural Adjustment Act.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The valuable contribution of the Senator from Minnesota will doubtless in part help further to explain to farmers of the beet and cane regions of this country the plight in which they have found themselves during recent years.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I wanted to call the Senator's attention to the fact that the figures based on the Agricultural Adjustment Act handicap the farmer, even though he should get parity figured under this formula, which he still does not get.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I thank the Senator for his helpful statement.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to his colleague?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I yield with pleasure to my colleague.

Mr. ADAMS. It occurs to me that there is another element in the computation of the parity which also works unfavorably and unjustly to the sugar-beet price. Parity, as I understand, under the formula which was applied, is based upon the years from 1909 to 1914. Those were years of very intense competition in the sugar business. The tariff at that time as against our chief competitor, which was Cuba, was practically only 1 cent a pound, or a very trifling fraction above that. It was half of what the present tariff is. So we are having a comparison of present-day prices under a 2-cent tariff with a price then under a 1-cent tariff and the intense competitive condition when Cuba was producing very largely.

Mr. COSTIGAN. What my able colleague, the junior Senator from Colorado, has said is, of course, informative. It may be added that the tariff of about 1 cent a pound to which the Senator refers was the lowest in half a century.

Mr. President, perhaps an anticipatory word should be devoted to certain objections urged at different times against the proposed legislation. The freedom of farmers to continue to produce farm products at a loss is not the most fortunate liberty. Freedom to starve is not valuable. The claim that continental sugar producers should be permitted to produce all sugar consumed in the United States has a familiar and even instinctive appeal, and conceivably the day will arrive in a changed world when farmers in this country will provide such self-sufficiency. However, it should be noted that generations of favorable sugar tariffs have fallen far short of achieving such results. Under the complex competitive forces affecting sugar, with increasing visible supplies of sugar in the world, the price of sugar has been driven toward unprecedentedly low levels.

For example, in 1922-23 the average price per pound c. and f., New York, was 4.674 cents, with 3,025,000 short tons of visible supply. In subsequent years as visible supplies continued to rise prices continued to fall. In 1932-33 the average price per pound c. and f., New York, had dropped to 1.119 cents, with 7,800,000 short tons, according to a preliminary estimate, as the visible supply.

Mr. President, I now offer a table to be found at page 267 of World Trade Barriers in Relation to Agriculture, Senate Document No. 70, of the Seventy-third Congress, first session, which specifies visible supplies of world sugar stocks and prices in parallel columns.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the table will be printed in the RECORD.

The table is as follows:

World sugar stocks and prices  
[1,000 short tons]

Year	Visible supply, Sept. 1 <sup>1</sup>	Average price c. and f. New York <sup>1</sup>
		Cents per pound
1922-23.....	3,025	4.674
1923-24.....	2,870	4.677
1924-25.....	2,705	3.128
1925-26.....	3,990	2.350
1926-27.....	4,450	2.959
1927-28.....	4,539	2.691
1928-29.....	5,191	2.011
1929-30.....	5,842	1.744
1930-31.....	6,972	1.317
1931-32.....	8,369	1.024
1932-33.....	7,800	1.119

<sup>1</sup> World Trade Barriers in Relation to Agriculture, p. 267 (S.Doc. No. 70, 73d Cong., 1st sess.).

<sup>2</sup> Lamborn & Co.'s Annual Chart.

<sup>3</sup> Preliminary.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Mr. President, under bounties, low tariffs, and relatively high tariffs, the increase in domestic

production of beet sugar has only slowly advanced during the last half century, and the production of cane sugar is considerably less than its former highest level. Leaving out our insular possessions and other sources of supply, after half a century of free and unlimited opportunity to produce, the continental United States now produces from one fourth to one third of the continental consumption.

In other words, considering production and prices together, the right to unlimited production has brought not prosperity, but the reverse, not higher but lower returns to sugar farmers in the United States.

One of the noteworthy features of the pending bill is found in its new approach to the solution of many and multiplying difficulties of the domestic sugar industry. It has been hoped that clearer foresight than that so far legislatively displayed will be applied to this involved subject. All who believe in human values and sensible national planning ought to welcome such an effort as is embodied in the pending measure. Too many cooks have been interfering with the broth to make it a perfect legislative product, but Congress will do well if in its constructive efforts it can claim an advance over the past. So much may confidently be asserted on behalf of the present measure. Fortunately, it is acceptable in its present form to the most representative growers of the industry, who are at this time petitioning Members of the Senate promptly to enact it. The legislation promises to afford a common meeting ground for the adjustment of major production and marketing problems. Self-destroying methods have too long invited misfortune to the domestic industry until growers, East and West, find themselves in a sorry plight indeed.

No clearer statement of the importance of the legislation has been voiced than that issued by the Secretary of Agriculture on March 16 of this year. Secretary Wallace stated, in substance, that one of the chief objectives of the administration's sugar plan is to stabilize the sugar industry and to prevent a threatened collapse of prices, which would bring distress to some 80,000 farmers engaged in domestic-sugar production; and he might have added many other thousands of human beings affected by its prosperity or adversity. He said further that a disastrous price decline faces the industry unless definite restrictions of shipments can halt the effects of insular production on the American market; that unless this legislation is enacted, administration estimates point to a price for sugar beets as low as \$4 per ton for this year's crop as against a basic assured return of about \$6.50 per ton.

This means, according to Secretary Wallace, a return to beet growers under the law of about \$63,000,000, as against a return to the producers of \$34,000,000, or less, if the measure does not become law. The Secretary further suggested that through the combination of benefit payments and a reduced tariff these substantially improved conditions can be put into effect in this industry by the Department of Agriculture without adding, by reason of the program, to the burdens of consumers. In addition, improved sugar prices throughout the world, beneficial to all the regions supplying the continental American market, should result from the legislation.

Mr. President, for general information, and particularly in view of the likelihood that the present discussion will continue tomorrow, I ask to have incorporated in the RECORD, following my remarks, two tables, the first showing sources of sugar consumed in the United States during the years 1924 to 1933, both inclusive; the second giving the figures with respect to beet-sugar production, by States, harvested acreage in 1933, and short tons, raw value, produced in the 3 last crop years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the request of the Senator from Colorado is granted.

(The tables submitted by Mr. COSTIGAN and ordered to be printed in the RECORD are as follows:)

Quantity of raw cane sugar (or its equivalent) from each crop source used in supplying domestic consumption in the United States during years 1924 to 1933, inclusive  
[In short tons—raw basis]

Period	Total, all crop sources	Grown in continental United States		Grown in United States insular areas				Grown in foreign countries	
		Beet	Cane	Puerto Rico	Hawaii	Philippine Islands	Virgin Islands	Cuba	All other foreign countries
Calendar years:									
1933	6,316,000	1,366,000	315,000	791,000	989,500	1,241,000	4,500	1,601,000	8,000
1932	6,248,500	1,318,500	160,000	910,500	1,024,000	1,042,000	4,500	1,762,500	26,500
1931	6,561,500	1,343,000	206,000	743,500	967,000	815,000	2,000	2,440,000	40,000
1930	6,710,500	1,140,500	197,500	780,000	808,000	804,500	6,000	2,945,500	30,500
1929	6,964,000	1,026,500	189,000	460,900	928,500	724,500	4,000	3,613,000	17,500
1928	6,642,500	1,243,000	138,500	698,500	819,000	570,500	11,000	3,125,000	35,000
1927	6,348,000	935,000	46,500	578,000	762,000	521,000	6,500	3,491,000	6,500
1926	6,793,500	1,046,000	84,000	551,000	740,500	375,000	6,000	3,944,500	47,500
1925	6,893,000	1,063,500	149,500	603,500	763,000	455,000	10,000	3,486,000	40,500
1924	5,817,500	892,500	98,000	409,500	608,500	318,000	2,500	3,384,500	104,000

Total beet-sugar production, by States, of all United States beet-sugar companies for the 1933-34 campaign and comparison with previous years

State	Harvested acres, 1933	Short tons, raw value		
		1933-34	1932-33	1931-32
Colorado	212,000	426,154	295,629	395,420
California	108,000	289,902	227,856	178,004
Michigan	161,000	182,135	182,919	86,118
Utah	76,000	153,068	186,935	82,657
Idaho	72,000	139,885	116,092	49,240
Nebraska	87,000	128,605	120,764	134,822
Montana	66,000	132,218	115,370	98,673
Wyoming	60,000	111,493	90,575	90,925
Ohio	36,000	41,000	40,346	11,046
Minnesota		50,457	44,899	40,637
Iowa		26,852	25,469	24,559
Wisconsin		17,826	16,763	12,331
Kansas		14,886	11,892	8,762
South Dakota		14,553	13,571	11,220
Indiana		10,668		
Washington		6,417	6,773	3,898
Seven States <sup>1</sup>	108,000			
Total	986,000	1,756,229	1,445,853	1,228,312

<sup>1</sup> Minnesota, Iowa, Wisconsin, Kansas, South Dakota, Indiana, Washington.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Certainly.

Mr. KING. Whether it is germane to the observations of the able Senator I am not sure, but may I ask a question? If we were not threatened with the execution of a recommendation made by the Tariff Commission of a reduction in the tariff, does the Senator think there would be any justification for the legislation?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Mr. President, the question of the able Senator from Utah is difficult to answer concisely. The need for a new method of dealing with the sugar problem must be obvious to any one who has carefully studied its history. In my judgment force is added to the appeal for the prompt enactment of the legislation by the circumstance that the Tariff Commission, for the second time in approximately 10 years, has recommended a reduction in the tariff on sugar on the basis of a cost-of-production rate-changing formula established for the Tariff Commission by a Republican Congress acting in conjunction with a Republican President.

Nevertheless it has long been my personal judgment that if the people of the United States desire as heretofore to continue to pay for the maintenance of a sugar industry in this country, a far more economical method is through the combination of a lower tariff than that which the country has been sanctioning, with the addition of bounty payments direct to beet and cane growers.

Mr. President, before I conclude, may I ask to have added to the other tables at the conclusion of my remarks one further tabulation. It shows the course of sugar beets harvested in the United States since the beginning of the period of substantial sugar-beet cultivation in this country and concluding with the year 1933, and on the margin discloses the tariff rates or bounty provisions, as the case may be, ap-

licable to the sugar industry during those years. It further shows the sugar produced in long tons during those years and the number of factories in operation in the continental United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the request of the Senator from Colorado is granted.

Acres of sugar beets harvested in the United States since the beginning of beet-sugar cultivation in the United States<sup>1</sup>

	Year	Acreage harvested	Sugar produced, refined (long tons)	Number of factories
Bounty of 2 cents on 90° sugar	1891	7,155	5,356	6
	1892	13,128	12,018	6
	1893	19,645	19,550	6
	1894	19,538	20,992	5
	1895	22,948	29,220	6
	1896	57,239	37,536	7
	1897	41,272	40,399	9
	1898	37,400	32,471	15
	1899	135,305	72,944	31
	1900	132,000	76,859	34
40 percent ad valorem	1901	175,083	163,126	39
	1902	216,400	195,463	44
	1903	242,576	208,135	53
	1904	197,784	209,722	51
	1905	307,354	283,717	53
	1906	378,074	433,010	63
	1907	370,984	440,260	63
	1908	364,913	384,010	63
	1909	420,262	450,595	65
	1910	398,029	455,220	63
1.348 on Cuba, 1.685 on others	1911	473,877	541,101	67
	1912	555,300	624,004	73
	1913	580,006	655,298	71
	1914	483,400	646,257	60
	1915	611,301	779,756	67
	1916	665,308	734,577	74
	1917	665,000	682,867	91
	1918	594,000	674,892	89
	1919	692,000	652,957	90
	1920	872,000	969,419	97
1.60 on Cuba, 2 on others	1921	815,000	911,190	92
	1922	530,000	615,936	81
	1923	657,000	787,217	89
	1924	815,000	974,185	91
	1925	647,000	804,439	88
	1926	677,000	801,246	79
	1927	721,000	965,241	82
	1928	644,000	938,640	83
	1929	688,000	901,713	79
	1930	775,000	1,075,688	78
1.7648 on Cuba, 2.206 on others	1931	713,000	1,025,217	86
	1932	768,000	1,206,656	75
	1933	984,000	1,450,000	85
	1933 <sup>2</sup>			

<sup>1</sup> Willett & Gray's Weekly Statistical Trade Journal. <sup>2</sup> Preliminary figures.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

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

Mr. COSTIGAN. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. The bill provides that in the case of sugar beets and sugar cane the calendar year shall be the marketing year. It is my information that since the beginning of this calendar year a great deal of sugar has been brought into continental United States from the Philippines and possibly from some other sources of production. I have been informed that as much as 800,000 tons has been brought into the United States from the Philippine Islands.

What I wish to know is whether or not the Senator from Colorado interprets the provisions of his bill to mean that the quotas shall go into effect as of January 1, 1934?

Mr. COSTIGAN. It is my understanding that the quotas will be effective as of January 1, 1934. The Senator from Louisiana should give careful consideration to the language of the bill and, if in any doubt, should discuss it with representatives of the Department of Agriculture. Those representatives, however, have assured me, and I believe that the measure, if now adopted, will fix the quotas as of January 1, 1934.

Mr. OVERTON. Therefore, whatever sugar has been imported from those outside sources would be charged up against the different areas?

Mr. COSTIGAN. If brought in since January 1, 1934, it would be, I assume, included in the respective quotas for this year.

Mr. VANDENBERG obtained the floor.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President—

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. McNARY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GIBSON in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

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

Adams	Copeland	Hebert	Pope
Ashurst	Costigan	Johnson	Reed
Austin	Couzens	Kean	Reynolds
Bachman	Cutting	Keyes	Robinson, Ind.
Bailey	Dickinson	King	Russell
Bankhead	Dieterich	Lewis	Schall
Barbour	Dill	Logan	Sheppard
Barkley	Duffy	Loneragan	Shipstead
Black	Erickson	Long	Steiwer
Bone	Fess	McCarran	Stephens
Borah	Fletcher	McGill	Thomas, Okla.
Brown	Frazier	McKellar	Thomas, Utah
Bulkley	George	McNary	Thompson
Bulow	Gibson	Metcalf	Townsend
Byrd	Glass	Murphy	Vandenberg
Byrnes	Goldsborough	Neely	Van Nuys
Capper	Gore	Norris	Wagner
Caraway	Hale	Nye	Walcott
Carey	Harrison	O'Mahoney	Walsh
Clark	Hastings	Overton	White
Connally	Hatch	Patterson	
Coolidge	Hayden	Pittman	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-six Senators have answered to the roll call. A quorum is present.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Haltigan, one of its clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the reports of the committees of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the following bills of the Senate:

S. 828. An act to authorize boxing in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; and

S. 2999. An act to guarantee the bonds of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, to amend the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, and for other purposes.

#### ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H.R. 8018. An act to authorize payment for the purchase of, or to reimburse States or local levee districts for the cost of levee rights-of-way for flood-control work in the Mississippi Valley, and for other purposes;

H.R. 8402. An act to place the cotton industry on a sound commercial basis, to prevent unfair competition and practices in putting cotton into the channels of interstate and foreign commerce, to provide funds for paying additional benefits under the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and for other purposes; and

S.J.Res. 70. Joint resolution to provide for the reappointment of John C. Merriam as a member of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

#### INCLUSION OF SUGAR BEETS AND CANE AS BASIC COMMODITIES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8861) to include sugar beets and sugar cane as basic agri-

cultural commodities under the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and for other purposes.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, as a basis for my observations and analysis in respect to this critically important piece of proposed legislation, I desire to lay down first the presumed purposes to which the measure is addressed and the official statement of the ambitious pretensions that are made in its behalf.

I assume that the fairest way to submit these affirmative credentials on behalf of the proposed legislation is to read a paragraph or two from the favorable report of the Senate Finance Committee.

The committee report says:

This bill has as its primary object the stabilization of the sugar industry to prevent a threatened collapse of prices which would bring distress to some 80,000 farmers engaged in sugar production in continental United States. Unless corrective measures are adopted, as proposed in this bill, the returns to beet and cane growers will probably continue to be insufficient to furnish them an adequate return for their efforts.

This bill follows substantially the President's message of February 8, 1934.

I interrupt the reading at that point to dissent cordially from that statement in the committee's report. If this proposed legislation still responded to the literal spirit of the President's message of February 8, 1934, or if it continued to reflect the original purposes disclosed by the Department of Agriculture, I doubt whether a majority of this or the other body of Congress would remotely subscribe to it, as it evidently intends to do.

I continue reading, however:

The program contained therein—

Referring to the President's message—

recognizes a duty to stabilize the price and production of sugar for the benefit of the continental producers and the industry of the insular possessions and at the same time to maintain a fair price for sugar to the consumer.

The benefits to be derived from this bill are not limited to a small group. If enacted into law, it will indeed contribute to the general welfare of the United States as a whole. The increased purchasing power which this bill will bring to domestic producers of sugar cane and sugar beets, the returns to whom will probably amount to some \$80,000,000 as against possible returns of \$50,000,000, in the absence of legislation, will enable these producers to purchase manufactured goods and thus help keep our factories running and our factory labor employed.

Then dropping down in the report, I desire to read just two additional paragraphs in the summary of the principal objectives which are stated by the committee to be addressed by the pending legislation:

The program for sugar as proposed in this bill has the following four principal objectives:

(1) To insure stability to the domestic producers of sugar beets and sugar cane by giving them a virtual guarantee of fair exchange or parity returns on a level of production representing more continental sugar than has ever been successfully sold in a single year.

(2) To assure greater stability to the sugar industry through the provision of adequate quotas for the territories, the insular possessions, and other sugar-producing areas, but preventing the impact of overproduction from so depressing the market as to decrease returns to domestic producers.

Mr. President, I agree that this is a thoroughly happy prospectus if warranted in any reliable degree. I know that the distinguished senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. COSTIGAN], the author of the bill, thoroughly agrees with that prospectus and believes in it. The Senator from Colorado is an earnest, honest man, and every claim he has submitted upon the floor on behalf of this proposed legislation has behind it the complete integrity of his purpose. I desire to make this statement without equivocation before I proceed to indicate that from my viewpoint he may be leaning on a broken reed. I regret to say that I cannot disassociate my attitude in respect to this measure from some of the initial experiences which we had in respect to its consideration.

I sincerely hope and pray that the able Senator from Colorado is wholly correct in the prophecies which he has uttered this morning, and in the prospectus from which I have read to the Senate.

If he is correct, it can be a benediction upon the industry. If he is not correct, the pending legislation will be an utter

curse upon the industry. The answer, as I shall presently demonstrate, lies entirely within the control of the President and the Secretary of Agriculture and their associated commissars in the Agricultural Adjustment Administration. We are proposing for the time being, as I shall presently indicate, to give them the benefit of the doubt.

I want to proceed now to discuss the bill, as I believe in complete candor, and as I believe with complete justification.

Mr. President, this sugar-control bill in its original form, and in the plainly expressed purpose of its original sponsors in the Departments of Agriculture and of State, was intended primarily to save Cuba at the expense of American farmers and American industrialists. Furthermore, the experts in the Department of Agriculture were particularly hospitable to this alien ideal because they frankly admitted that in their Olympian judgments there is small place for domestic beet and cane sugar in their feudal programs for the regimentation of the American farm and the American fireside.

These inimical purposes were frankly reflected in the original bill and in the President's sugar message of February 8. It is my belief that the stage was arranged for the progressive demise of the domestic-sugar industry. The funeral hour was set; and the Department of Agriculture's bureaucracy was efficiently prepared to serve as mortician. But the corpse unexpectedly and most inconsiderately came to life. It declined to be embalmed without a struggle—and it has been struggling with some degree of success ever since. As a result, the sugar-control bill in its final pending and much-amended form is decidedly less deadly than was the original certificate of interment. Indeed, domestic sugar may discover that it has escaped the intended sepulcher. For this we are duly thankful. Yet the whole scheme continues to be haunted with the ghosts of intended slaughter. Its lethal atmosphere continues to violate the life-giving promises of the new deal—as I shall presently undertake to demonstrate.

I fervently hope and pray that the compensatory benefits which the able and always conscientious Senator from Colorado [Mr. COSTIGAN], the author of the bill, proclaims will truly bring a net advantage to this great industry. If a net advantage arrives, however, it will be largely due to the protective amendments which we have forced into the legislation and to a somewhat chastened attitude on the part of the Agricultural Department's "sugar commissars", who surely have discovered during the last 8 weeks of argument and negotiation that sugar beets and sugar cane in continental United States are not the dead commodities which were so contemptuously dismissed to relative disintegration in the first instance.

REAL HOPE—ADMINISTRATORS CAN SAVE ALL

Mr. President, those who have a right to speak for domestic sugar farmers and processors in this emergency reluctantly announce that they have no choice except to ask for the passage of the bill—indeed, any bill—because of the impending purpose of the President to reduce the sugar tariff. Against the latter hazard, their only relative hope is the substitution of quota protection.

In such circumstances, any quotas, however hostile, are better than none at all. They must take what they can get. But let this be plain, namely, that they are not free agents when they make their choice. It has been said that they choose with a gun at their head. That is the truth. It is a double-barreled gun. One barrel is loaded with impending sugar-tariff reductions, menacingly promised by the President; the other barrel is loaded with unrestricted Philippine imports until such time as the new and inadequate Philippine bill becomes effective. Parenthetically, I may say that was one of the reasons why I voted against the Philippine bill, which was enacted, and under which we are now operating. Since these hazards appear unavoidable, domestic sugar is driven not only to accept but actually to seek the offsets provided in the pending measure. They are offsets by the explicit terms of the bill itself, because the processing taxes are tied to the tariff reduction, and the former cannot exceed the latter. But let it stand utterly clear that they are embraced as offsets only. They would

never be embraced if domestic sugar were a free agent to choose its own destiny and write its own ticket.

Cotton farmers asked for the cotton bill, with its limitations and its regimentation and its strait-jackets, because they expect, rightly or wrongly, a net advantage for themselves. Beet farmers ask for this sugar bill not in the expectation of a net advantage but to partially hold their own against these other unavoidable dangers which this administration flings at their heads. This is my language—not theirs. They are prepared to cooperate in faith, however timid, that they will get fair play. But this has been a plain and truthful statement of their status. This bill, in my view, is not their emancipation. It is simply their reprieve from something needlessly worse.

Mr. President, the chief beet-producing State in the eastern area is the Commonwealth of Michigan, which I have the honor to represent in part. Sugar beets are one of our few remaining dependable cash crops. Sugar processing is a major industrial activity in several of our finest communities. We have not been able to contemplate this problem with the abstract detachment of a theorist in his experimental laboratory or a crystal gazer in his trance. We are at grips with the grim realities. We have been and still will be fighting for our lives.

These Michigan beet farmers have been represented in Washington during the last 8 momentous weeks by their chosen and authentic representatives, not as lobbyists but as ambassadors pleading with their overlords for their rights. These Michigan processors, just recovering from the bludgeonings of the depression, have been similarly represented by spokesmen with authority to speak for their industry.

I digress long enough to pay my compliments to these men and to the patience and the earnestness and the vigor with which they have sought to defend their position and salvage their chance to survive. They have done all that anyone could do. We have been in almost constant conference. The greatest thing which they have gained, I dare to hope, is a favorable contact with those administrative authorities which will still have much tell-tale power under the terms of this bill. In behalf of these authorities I must add, in fairness, that there has been every willingness to listen and to learn. I must add also that, much as I disagree with Mr. Secretary Wallace, I have the greatest respect for his candor and his inherent integrity of purpose and his intention to be fair.

But this is the point. These Michigan authorities, accredited to speak for sugar farm and sugar factory, have set down their conclusions in a letter addressed to me, which I send to the desk and ask to have read by the clerk:

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

FARMERS & MANUFACTURERS BEET SUGAR ASSOCIATION,  
Washington, D.C., April 6, 1934.

Senator ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG,  
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR VANDENBERG: There are attached hereto several amendments to S. 3212 which we would appreciate having you present to the Committee on Finance for consideration in connection with H.R. 8861, which passed the House of Representatives on April 4, 1934, and which has also been referred to the Committee on Finance.

We have been reluctant to support these bills including, as they do, a restriction on continental production. It has seemed to us, as applied to sugar of which there has at no time been an exportable surplus—continental production being less than one third of domestic-consumption requirements—that any such policy does violence to the principle of preserving the American market for our own people.

However, since the President of the United States in a message to Congress dated February 8 suggested that "we ought first to try a system of quotas" before the President would "recommend placing sugar on the free list", we have decided that it is better to have a bill which does apply a system of quotas to all insular areas furnishing sugar to the United States, rather than to face drastic reductions in the duty and an increase in the existing preferential on Cuban sugar, to which the President declared "favorable consideration will be given", all of which without a system of quotas would mean disaster to the continental industry.

We do not consider that all the regulations and penal provisions of the bills are necessary or appropriate to a sugar-control program.

The attached amendments make the bills less objectionable. We urge their adoption.

Accordingly, from the standpoint of expediency, and particularly in view of the assurances given by the Secretary of Agriculture of the benefits to result to our farmers under the contemplated plan, it is our desire that you give your support to an early passage of the bill in the least possible objectionable form. But, in any event, we reluctantly assert our need for a bill under existing circumstances.

Very truly yours,

SHERWIN A. HILL,  
A. W. BEEBE,  
F. L. CRAWFORD,  
*Legislative Committee.*  
C. R. OVIATT,  
*Growers' Representative.*

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, the cultivation and manufacture of sugar are highly technical operations. A decision reflecting marketing influences and production influences involves highly trained judgment. I would not consider that I am entitled to place my own judgments ahead of those of the gentlemen who have signed this communication, who are officially accredited to speak in Washington upon behalf of this great industry and this great agricultural commodity back home in Michigan. Therefore I am reluctantly consenting to the viewpoint which is submitted in the letter, but I am not doing it, Mr. President, until I have squarely laid before the Senate and the Congress and the country the full implications that are involved in this program, so that there may be no mistake tomorrow respecting the warning that is sounded and the responsibility for which we shall hold the Department of Agriculture to account.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LEWIS. I recall to the Senator that he made an observation in which he said: "This bill is here in behalf of and supported by", as I understood it, "the beet-sugar interests, but while they do not regard it as sufficient they do regard it as a reprieve"?

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is correct.

Mr. LEWIS. Therefore, I ask the able Senator, is this bill presented by the beet-sugar interests, and is it presented by the beet-sugar interests as being a beet-sugar bill?

Mr. VANDENBERG. It was not presented by them. It is accepted by them under protest, and I will make it plain before I have concluded why their protest is justified and why they have no alternative but to accept the bill.

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

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Mr. President, the statement that the bill is being accepted under protest comes as a surprise so far as I am concerned. It may be, of course, that certain beet-sugar interests in Michigan are protesting. There were formerly protests from various sugar-beet-growing interests, but, unless I am misinformed, the sugar-beet growers of the United States—at least the great majority of them—are now cordially desirous of having the proposed legislation enacted.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I am not sure that there is very much difference between the Senator and myself. I think the beet-sugar farmers of the country do most prayerfully ask for this legislation at the moment, but my proposition is that they are driven into that attitude, not as a free-will attitude but by the sheer necessity of escape from other hazards to which I have adverted and which threaten them. Insofar as I am speaking about sugar interests which accept this bill under protest, I would not presume to speak for others than the farmers in the eastern area, from whom I have presented an official communication stating that they accept the bill reluctantly. "Reluctantly" is their word.

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

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. COSTIGAN. One of the strongest communications endorsing the proposed legislation has been received by me from a leading beet grower who resides at Mount Clemens, in the State of the Senator from Michigan. Later, as an expression of the attitude of some growers in that region, I

shall take occasion to quote for the RECORD from the letter to which I refer.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I shall be glad to have the Senator offer the letter. There seems to be no question about the official spokesmanship of those who are in Washington with the authenticated commission to speak for the beet farmers of Michigan. If there are, here and there, beet farmers who disagree with the policy to which in unison they have subscribed their reluctant faith, I should not be at all surprised.

Furthermore, if any of my farm friends have listened to the senior Senator from Colorado, I should not be at all surprised if they were filled with a glowing enthusiasm in behalf of this formula.

As I said in the beginning, I have the utmost respect for the integrity of the opinion which the Senator from Colorado submits. I hope with all my heart he is right and that my fears are wrong. But if he and his school of thought have presented their blandishments to any of my constituents, without rebuttal, I would not be at all surprised if the Senator had a response which is entirely enthusiastic. I repeat that I hope the Senator is right. I repeat that we have now amended this bill so that it has considerable insurance against disadvantage. I repeat that the Secretary of Agriculture can, if he will, administer it to our distinct advantage. I am pleading that these favorable trends be given fullest possible play.

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

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The able Senator from Michigan is invariably courteous and instructive. I merely desire to add to what I stated a moment ago that it is in no sense true that the support which is coming to this measure from the great majority of representative leaders of the sugar-beet growers of the region I have the honor, in part, to represent is compulsory. As a matter of fact, the measure which is now pending before us has been subjected to the closest and most careful scrutiny and analysis. In the beginning it met extensive opposition in our intermountain region. That opposition has turned to affirmative and warm support. In confirmation of what I say I venture to ask the attention of the Senator from Michigan to the few out of many telegrams from that region which were placed by me in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD yesterday afternoon.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Yes, Mr. President; I heard the telegrams read upon yesterday, and with great respect for the Senator's interpretation of those telegrams, the interpretation I put upon those telegrams is that since the planting season presses the farmers in the West, and since some decision of some sort must be made, yes or no, in respect to this legislation before any progress whatsoever can be made in respect to the crop planting, they telegraphed the Senator, and he presented the messages to the Senate asking for a decision, and I think the chief urgency in the messages was less for this particular measure than for a decision in respect to the pending question. In other words, the whole industry is deadlocked in an impasse—at the very moment when the seed must go into the ground—until Congress settles the sugar-control question.

Mr. President, regardless of what the Senator's farm friends think, and what my farm friends think, I know what I think, and I continue to submit my views to the Senate.

The letter which was read from Michigan spokesmen requested the addition of certain life-saving amendments to the bill. I am very happy to say that I presented those amendments to the Senate Committee on Finance; that I was given a most courteous and sympathetic hearing; and all the amendments, with one exception, have been adopted and are in the committee report of the bill. Therefore the measure appears to merit the "reluctant"—that is not my word—that is quoted from the letter—merits the reluctant consent which has been indicated.

The original proposition, however, in its original form, Mr. President, was utterly impossible. It seems to me that

it still is bad in many of its implications and its latitudes. Nevertheless, with a tariff reduction imminent—and that sword of Damocles hangs squarely over the head of the domestic-sugar industry this afternoon—with a tariff reduction imminent—the sugar industry must be sheltered some other way if it is to survive.

The only recourse under such circumstances, the only possible thing that they could do by way of self-defense, is to seek shelter under the Agricultural Adjustment Act through some such formula as in the pending bill. But as the letter states, "We consent to the whole proposition with the utmost reluctance, and we do it chiefly with a feeling"—as I have previously said, and as so eloquently argued by Congressman WOODRUFF, of Michigan, in the lower House—"we do it in the sense that there is a gun at our heads as we proceed."

The record must show that we are reluctant; the record must show the nature and implication of the whole transaction in justice to this tremendously important farm and industrial commodity in the life and livelihood of the United States.

Furthermore, Mr. President, there is another reason why this discussion may well go on; and it is a thoroughly pertinent and tangible reason. The truth of the matter is that as this bill is drawn, and as it now impends in the Senate, it provides certain minimum quotas but it does not confine the Secretary of Agriculture to those minimums. As this bill is drawn today, there is entire latitude within the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture to make his subsequent quotas on a basis which will not close a single sugar mill in the United States and which will not strip a single beet farmer's sugar crop by a single pound. It will be entirely within the power, authority, and discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture, after this proposed legislation shall be passed, still to fix these quotas on a basis which will leave American agriculture with a 100-percent opportunity to produce sugar beets and will still leave beet-sugar processors with a 100-percent opportunity to operate the factories that are waiting for a chance to thrive. There is nothing that compels the President to reduce the sugar tariff. There is nothing that compels the allocation of a short quota. These administrations can still save the whole situation if they please.

We have simply put a bottom limit in the bill so that the Secretary of Agriculture cannot undermine us and gut us from below. The opportunity exists, I repeat, for him to decide whether or not this literal minimum shall become, in fact, the maximum and shall thus close some of our sugar factories, and thus put some of our sugar farmers out of beet production. The decision is for the Secretary to make. He can keep the factories running if he wants so to do. If they shall close it will be the result of his decision; it will not be the result automatically of this proposed legislation. If farmers shall be driven out of beet production it will not be automatically the result of the pending legislation; it will be the result primarily of the decisions made by the Secretary of Agriculture and his associates in the triple A, because that is where the edict will be written which spells life or death for a great factor in this great agricultural and industrial commodity.

Mr. President, of course, it is well known that I am a loyal partisan of the sugar-beet industry; that statement scarcely needs to be made. I believe in the sugar-beet industry. Sugar beets constitute one of the finest and most profitable of farm crops and the basis for one of the most useful of our processing industries. The maintenance of a domestic industry is absolutely vital to the consumer himself in order that he may be protected in his ultimate competitive retail price. I have fought upon the floor of the Senate for the sugar-beet farmers; I always shall. We shall still have them to protect even after the enactment of this proposed legislation partially transfers their fate and destiny to the hands of the administrators of the triple A; but the pending theory of sugar control violates the consistency of the existing situation in the United States upon a number of different accounts. It is at war with the recovery pro-

gram, which is being prosecuted so courageously in many other directions.

I suppose it is a waste of time to discuss inconsistencies in a period like this. We are entirely surrounded by inconsistencies. This bill is riddled with inconsistencies. For example, in passing, speaking of inconsistencies in our agricultural program in general, at the present time we are spending several hundred million dollars to curtail a corn surplus, and we are embarked upon some very dubious adventures in an effort to reduce this corn surplus which is supposed to be destroying the welfare of the corn farmer in the United States; and yet, at the same time, the Department of Agriculture up until November 1933 was still circulating Bulletin No. 414, which has for its purpose, in the language of its own subheading, the teaching of the American farmer "the possibility of doubling the present yields in corn." The Department took that particular bulletin out of circulation in November 1933, but here are more bulletins that are still circulating—I got them today. Have they stopped telling the American farmer how to increase his corn crop? Oh, no. Here is Bulletin No. 1714. I read from the second page just a sentence to indicate what is going on:

These practices—

Referring to the advice that has been given—

These practices, with the supplemental use of commercial fertilizers to supply special needs, can be relied upon to increase acre yield.

This is a good, substantial bulletin which we are now paying our money to have published and circulated in order to teach the farmer how to increase corn acre yield at the very moment when we are appropriating hundreds of millions of dollars to correct the situation as a result of the acre yield already existing.

I do not desire to enlarge upon this particular phase of the discussion, but here is another bulletin—no. 773—from which I read:

By reducing the waste of moisture and heat corn yields can be doubled.

Still showing the farmers how to double their corn yields. Here is Bulletin No. 1175, from page 3 of which I quote the following:

Improving the quality of seed corn is one of the surest ways of increasing the yield.

I repeat, Mr. President, that that is just an indication of the inconsistencies with which we are confronted in respect to the hasty development of this experimental agricultural program.

But let me bring this contemplation of inconsistencies much closer to the immediate pending problem. On February 27, 1934, the Department of the Interior issued a press release, from which I read the following first sentence:

A new step forward in sugar-beet production may be taken as the result of experiments being conducted by the Reclamation Service of the Department of the Interior.

This is no ancient history; this was 60 days ago. The public is notified that the Reclamation Service of the Department of the Interior is at work upon experiments to increase sugar-beet production and particularly in respect to reclamation projects. A new step forward is being taken, we are told, in sugar-beet production.

But what does Mr. Secretary Wallace say simultaneously upon precisely that same subject? On February 23, which was the same week, Mr. Wallace stated in his testimony before the Senate committee—I have it in my hand—discussing the question of reclamation development in behalf of projects which depend upon sugar beets. Reading from the testimony:

Senator VANDENBERG. Is there a large new reclamation project or irrigation project coming in, in Wyoming, under the President's order, in respect to the P.W.A., which is contemplated as a beet-producing area, some 66,000 acres?

Secretary WALLACE. I do not know of any area that is contemplated as a beet-producing area. I suppose you are referring to the Casper-Alcova project.

I might digress to say that under the expectations of the Reclamation Service the Casper-Alcova project is solely de-

pendent upon sugar beets and alfalfa. There is absolutely no justification in proceeding with that project except that there can be sugar beets and alfalfa grown upon it.

Now let us see what the Secretary has to say as to whether or not there can be sugar beets grown upon it, in the light of this new sugar-control policy.

Mr. VANDENBERG. If we are going into sharp restrictions we certainly ought to restrict these irrigation and reclamation projects which contemplate increased production.

Secretary WALLACE. I agree with you completely, unless there is also a corresponding reduction in submarginal lands.

Then I read him the bulletin from the Reclamation Service, and I said to him:

That just seems to be a step directly opposite from the direction in which you are going.

Secretary WALLACE. I think so, too.

Mr. President, here is another inconsistency. The able Secretary of Agriculture frequently says to us that after we shall have made a great contribution to Cuban welfare and economy through the reduction of the Cuban preferential duty upon sugar, we in turn may hope to get a reflected dividend from that Cuban advantage through the sale of corn and hogs down yonder in the Pearl of the Antilles.

Here is a telegram, dated March 15, from Reginald Dykers, vice president of the American Sugar Cane League, in which he says:

Would consider it most unfortunate if rights and welfare of domestic-sugar industry were sacrificed through a faulty premise. Secretary Wallace bases his position on the theory that Cuba should be allowed to ship her sugar here so she can get the money to buy our corn and pork. Local corn dealer makes statement he would be importing corn from Cuba now if it were not for the 25-cent per bushel tariff. United States Department of Commerce states that Cuba produces exportable surplus of corn and is raising all her requirements in pork.

So, Mr. President, there is another of the incidental inconsistencies which we confront in connection with this agricultural program in general and with the sugar program in particular; but these are all incidentals.

Let me come down to the fundamental challenges which are involved, because they are indeed fundamental challenges.

Mr. President, first, the proposal which now pends before the Senate attacks a profitable cash farm crop at the very moment when we are presumably dedicating ourselves to an enlargement of farm revenue. It attacks a crop which is not upon a surplus basis. It is a crop which contributes only one fourth of the consumption in the United States. By no stretch of the imagination can it ever become a surplus crop, even though it were given intelligent governmental encouragement. But, in spite of the fact that it is not a surplus crop, in spite of the fact that it is far removed from any possibility of ever becoming a surplus crop, we find it used by the Department of Agriculture and by the Presidential program for that type of treatment which heretofore has been reserved exclusively for commodities which are on a surplus basis. I submit there is no consistency in applying the A.A.A. theory of surplus reduction and control to a commodity which has no surplus and which is not even remotely threatened with a surplus. We need control. But we do not need and we resent reduction.

Furthermore, I insist that at a time when the farmer is struggling for cash crops on every hand it is utterly inconsistent deliberately to cut him off from a portion of one of the best cash crops he has in large areas of the United States. This is not just a Michigan problem. It is a major problem in 16 States: California, Utah, Idaho, Washington, Colorado, Wyoming, Montana, Nebraska, Kansas, South Dakota, Minnesota, Iowa, Ohio, Wisconsin, and Indiana, as well as Michigan.

Mr. President, in my own State of Michigan sugar during the last year represented \$14,534,000, and that is a lot of money in a farm commodity in a time of farm depression such as we are now suffering. It involves the livelihood of 21,502 farmers. It involves the welfare of 21,762 beet workers. This is just in one State—the State of Michigan. It involves 5,466 factory workers, as well as others of incidental and collateral activity in connection with the process.

Why should the Government by mandate undertake to curtail these activities at the very moment when it is straining every effort to increase our employment and our farm prosperity? Farm prosperity, I may say in passing, is at the base of our entire regime and hope of stabilized recovery.

My first complaint, then, against the fundamental philosophy of the bill in respect of the inconsistencies which I have been discussing is that it is utterly without rational philosophy to attack one of the few cash crops in the United States which are not on a surplus basis for the purpose of forcing it into retrenchment at a time when, on the contrary, under the whole theory of agricultural encouragement which we are pursuing in other directions, we ought to be seeking to see how we can expand the crop instead of how we can reduce it.

Let us see as to the second fundamental objection. I insist that it is wholly inconsistent even with the ideas and purposes of the authors of the triple A processing tax program. The processing tax was supposed to apply solely for the purpose of discouraging surpluses and providing benefit payments in lieu of contributions to the reduction of surpluses. There can be no logical application in the present situation, as I have already indicated, because there is no surplus. I want to be understood in this connection as not objecting in any degree to a fair trial of the abstract theory of the processing tax. The processing tax is a rather poor paraphrase of the original equalization fee which was brought to the floor of the Senate time and time again in years past by the able senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] in the form of the McNary-Haugen bill. It was the first major legislation for which I voted when I came to the Senate in 1928. I shall always have the conviction that if this legislation could have been enacted 6 years ago, and the equalization fee put into effect, we would have avoided many of the agricultural difficulties which have pursued us in the interim.

The processing tax is something of a paraphrase—rather a poor analogy, nevertheless it is reminiscent of it—of the equalization fee. I am happy to see it reasonably tried in respect to surplus commodities. I should like to see it tried, for example, in respect to beans in Michigan this afternoon. But there is no rime or reason in applying it to a crop which is on a nonsurplus basis, and in no degree does it fit into the theory of the legislation itself under which the Agricultural Adjustment Act was originally developed. Furthermore, no processing tax has ever heretofore been proposed as an offset to a tariff reduction. Here and here alone do we find processing taxes and tariff duties tied together. They hurt us with tariff reduction; then they compensate us with benefits out of processing taxes. Our hope is that we come out at least even on the deal. But we must take the deal, whether we like it or not, or perish.

Mr. President, my third objection, and a very serious one, to the philosophy behind the existing legislation is the fact that it is born in the theory, apparently, that sooner or later the domestic sugar industry should die. It is not put so baldly, but there it baldly stands. There have been many belated attempts to salve our feelings and assuage our fears in respect of this contemplation of the matter. But I cannot forget, Mr. President, that in the Executive message of February 8, 1934, the President, in referring to the domestic-sugar industry, said it was necessary "to provide against expansion of this necessarily expensive industry."

The phrase drafted by the President of the United States himself originally to describe this industry which is to be put under the control of this legislation—the phrase which he used was that it is "a necessarily expensive industry." So much for his sounding of the reveille against this industry.

What next? I cannot forget that Secretary Wallace has described it as "an inefficient industry", nor can I overlook the fact that it seems to be implied in the pending tariff programs of the administration that so-called "inefficient industries" must be retired after they are thus malignantly identified by our high Federal planners.

So here we have "a necessarily expensive industry", as it is defined by the President of the United States, "an inefficient industry", as described by the Secretary of Agriculture, and we were put upon direct notice in the initial consideration of the bill that those adjectives were not applied without some ominous portent, because we were given to understand by direct testimony that the initial purpose, until it had been curbed, was progressively to put this commodity and this industry into serial disintegration. That is no stretch of the imagination.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. ADAMS. Is it not a fact that the bill is out of harmony with that clause of the President's message in that it provides that the domestic sugar industry shall be permitted to expand somewhat in larger proportion to the actual increase in domestic consumption of sugar?

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator is discussing the bill as it now pends in the Senate after it has been amended?

Mr. ADAMS. Yes.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I entirely agree with him, and I refer him to the fact that I said at the outset that the bill now pending represents a degree of solace which presents us with a totally different contemplation than the bill as it was originally drawn and as it originally impended. As it was originally drawn it was aimed squarely at the so-called "inefficient" and "expensive" sugar-beet industry.

What is the best test of the efficiency or inefficiency of an industry? It strikes me that the best test is the retail price the consumer has to pay for the commodity over a period of years. That is about the best test of expensiveness or efficiency that I know of in measuring or testing any commodity. I assert that in the average of the years sugar retails in the United States much cheaper than in any other country on the globe with but few exceptions. Is that an expensive sort of net result? Is that an inefficient net result?

I call attention to the fact, dealing with specific figures—

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President—

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

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. OVERTON. Is it not a fact that sugar retails in the United States at about one half the price for which it retails in European countries?

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is precisely what I am coming to. The Senator is entirely correct.

Here is a given day around the world, and these figures show the retail price of sugar converted into terms of American currency:

It is 11.79 cents in Germany.

It is 11.95 cents in Czechoslovakia.

It is 9.31 cents in Austria.

It is 14.28 cents in Hungary.

It is 10.09 cents in France.

It is 11.17 cents in Holland.

It is 10.24 cents in Poland.

It is 21.88 cents in Italy.

It is 403.63 cents in Russia.

It is 7.59 cents in the Argentine.

It is 6.35 cents just across the line in Canada.

In the United States, on the day these figures were compiled, the price of sugar was 4.34 cents; and that figure is bettered in consumer-price advantage only in Denmark, England, Java, and Japan. With those exceptions—and those exceptions are only by a small margin—sugar sells cheaper in America than in any other spot around all this globe. Is that inefficiency? Is that an expensive industry? By what token shall this industry, which is capable of bringing this consumer boon to the United States, be put under a sentence of death in any degree in the face of such a record? I submit that the President and his Secretary of Agriculture should recant their views and recall their imprecations.

Furthermore, Mr. President, mark this fact: The only time when the retail consumer in the United States has had to pay a highly tilted price for sugar was in 1920–21, when the beet crop had been withdrawn early in the season as a result of a world shortage and the diversion of the domestic supply elsewhere. That year, when we were totally at the mercy of the world price, without the intervening protection of an adequate existing domestic supply of sugar—that year, and that year alone, the price of sugar rose upon the store shelves of the United States to 25 and 30 cents a pound.

Where is your inefficient industry, Mr. President, by any right of such definition, when it can demonstrate by its own credentials that it is responsible for keeping the retail price of sugar in the United States within a minimum reach of the ultimate consumer? Yet we were told in an Executive message that the domestic sugar industry is an unnecessarily expensive industry, and we were told by the Secretary of Agriculture that it was inefficient!

I should like to know where there is an industry in this whole land that can prove any greater efficiency or any more right to be absolved from the charge that it is an excessively expensive operation.

Furthermore, Mr. President, those hostile phrases were not the only things that put us on warning, and which resulted in the successful battle which has been made to bring this bill into at least some reasonable degree of palatable form.

The sugar expert in the Department of Agriculture under the A.A.A. is an excellent gentleman by the name of Weaver, who, I understand, chiefly is familiar with the sugar industry because up to 90 days ago he was exclusively confined to the rice industry in his activities. [Laughter.] Mr. Weaver appeared before a House committee. Mr. Weaver was asked some rather embarrassing, or let us say, rather some pointed questions respecting the attitude of his Department, and the threat that is implicit in the inimical phrases I have quoted to you; and one Member of the other House said to Mr. Weaver in a burst of candor:

Now, is it not a fact that your purpose is to give the sugar industry a shot in the arm and then slide it out of business before it wakes up?

Mr. Weaver said "yes."

Mr. President, of course that caused consternation on all sides among the ranks of the advocates of this legislation; and there was a hasty pilgrimage down Pennsylvania Avenue. There was a little conference down at the White House. There was a somewhat reassuring announcement that what Mr. Weaver said did not represent the objectives and purposes of the administration or the A.A.A. A few days later the whole subject was under survey in our own Senate Finance Committee. I wanted to be fair about this anaesthetic that was planned for the sugar industry. I wanted to be fair to Mr. Weaver; so I asked Secretary Wallace what he thought about the frank admission that had been made by his sugar expert. He said:

Well, I will tell you, Senator. The trouble was that Mr. Weaver had taken an airplane ride the night before, and his ears were still ringing with the hum of the plane, and he did not hear very well.

[Laughter.]

Mr. President, that is probably a good excuse. I will forgive him for having been up in the air; but he must not complain if we find ourselves up in the air also in the face of such utterly hostile exhibits. [Laughter.]

I want to be fair to the Department. I think they have learned a good deal about the sugar business in the past few weeks. I think they have been perfectly amazed to find that it has had such inherent powers of resistance to the dictatorship that was charted for it; but I think they have been sympathetic in listening to our problems. I give them full credit for that; and I do not believe their attitude today is the same as it was 8 weeks ago, when this original plan was undertaken. Nevertheless, we cannot erase from the record the fact that this proposed legislation was born in the belief that the domestic sugar industry is inefficient, unnecessarily

expensive, and ought to be marked for serial distintegration over a period of years.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. FESS. I think nobody can question the fact that a major item in the present program is the increase of our foreign trade. That seems to be major in the minds of those who are looking for a larger recovery. How can there be an increase in our foreign trade by a change of tariffs unless we sacrifice some American industry that has a tariff on its product?

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator's question answers itself; and I agree with the answer that the question brings to itself.

Mr. FESS. And is it not obvious that some industry that might be claimed to be inefficient and expensive would be at least one that would be seized upon to be sacrificed if we are to carry out this policy?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Precisely.

Mr. FESS. I do not think any sort of explanation of why this or that statement was made lessens at all the force of the Senator's argument.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am happy to have the Senator's testimony. Let me divert just for a moment to prolong a comment upon that phase of the subject.

I have spoken about inconsistencies in the pending legislation. The Senator reminds me of the pending tariff-bargaining prospectus. We have before us a program in respect to an agricultural crop, a program based upon the specific threat that the tariff is to be reduced in respect to it; and yet, Mr. President, inherent in the N.R.A.—and I refer now to the act of Congress which created it—and inherent in the A.A.A.—and again I refer to the act of Congress which created it—is the contemplation that production costs are to be increased in the United States as a result of these acts, and that it may become necessary to protect those production costs with increased tariffs, even to the extent of embargoes, because inherent in both those laws are sections which specifically delegate a power to the President to create even an actual embargo in some instances for the purpose of protecting these increased production costs as a result of the N.R.A. and the A.A.A. Yet here we confront the first of the tariff bills—because that is what this bill is, even though it wears a different name. This is a bill to reduce the tariff on sugar. It is to be followed by a bill which will permit the President of the United States, in his own uncounseled wisdom, without any hearing permitted to anybody, without any appeal to anybody, to decide for himself what in his judgment are the inefficient and unnecessarily expensive industries of the United States, and, overnight, to pass a death sentence upon them.

Mr. HEBERT and Mr. COSTIGAN addressed the Chair.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield first to the Senator from Rhode Island. Then I will yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. HEBERT. Mr. President, I wish I could have the assurance of the Senator from Michigan in regard to industries in my State which have been referred to in the discussion by the Secretary of Agriculture as it was related in the proceedings before the Ways and Means Committee to which I alluded some days ago. The Senator from Michigan feels that he has some assurance that consideration will be given to the sugar industry.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Well, pretty thin; pretty thin. [Laughter.]

Mr. HEBERT. However thin it may be, I venture to say that it is thicker than that which I am led to believe we shall have in relation to the lace industry in my State, which, incidentally, has capital invested something like 100 percent greater than that of the beet-sugar industry.

Yet it was the only industry to which the Secretary of Agriculture referred in his testimony before the Ways and Means Committee as destined to pass out of existence in this country.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I will respond to the Senator from Rhode Island, and then I will yield to the Senator from Colorado.

I do not want to detour into a general tariff discussion. Nevertheless, I think I owe it to the RECORD to state very frankly that the United States Tariff Commission appears to have made a recommendation in favor of a reduction of the tariff on sugar under the flexible provisions of the existing law, and based on the assumption, at least, that the costs of production at home and abroad warrant this reduction. I have never been able to get a copy of that opinion of the Tariff Commission. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. COSTIGAN] assured me this morning that for the first time it is available. I shall be very happy to read it.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The assurance which I attempted to give the Senator from Michigan did not relate to the report of the Tariff Commission in its investigation of sugar. I incorporated in the RECORD a table prepared recently by the Tariff Commission. It was sent to me on request, and I have no doubt is also available for the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I thank the Senator. I want to call attention to this indisputable fact, and it is an all-controlling fact, insofar as any present recommendation of the Tariff Commission in regard to sugar-production costs is concerned.

The study referred to was made in pre-code days, speaking in terms of the N.R.A. That study was made in respect to costs of production prior to the existence of the N.R.A. I am advised that the N.R.A. has increased the processing costs in the production of sugar in one way and another by an average of 40 percent. Therefore, in the face of that fact, I shall have to submit and emphasize that any Tariff Commission report presuming or pretending to measure the difference in costs of production at home and abroad which was made prior to the N.R.A. is as ancient and irrelevant and incompetent in respect to the consideration of the difference in costs of production at home and abroad as if it had been made a century ago.

Does the Senator from Colorado desire to interrupt me further?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Mr. President, the eloquent Senator from Michigan has already indicated the qualification of his original statement about the President's new tariff policy which I rose to suggest, namely, that the reduction in the tariff on sugar will come in response to a recommendation already made by the United States Tariff Commission following a legally required investigation and public hearing. May I add that the Presidential action, if taken, will be under a law adopted by a Republican Congress and signed by President Hoover, and will be in accordance with rate-changing standards for tariff adjustments provided in the so-called "flexible" provisions of the law. It will, indeed, be taken in response to the recommendations of a commission, a majority of the members of which, I believe, are affiliated with the same political party to which the Senator from Michigan gives such effective allegiance.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I thank the Senator for his observations, and he gives me unexpected license to invade one phase of this discussion which I had not intended to enter. This is the first time in the debate that the word "Republican" has entered. My friend injected it. The word "Democrat" enters now also for the first time, and it enters only by way of rebuttal. It enters, Mr. President, in connection with an exhibit which I desire to lay upon the bar of the Senate. This should not be a partisan question, and I divert to partisan discussion only to answer my Democratic friend.

In the climax of the last campaign, to which the Senator from Colorado adverts, by implication, at least, there was made a special and particular appeal to the beet farmers of the State of Michigan to make them sure that they could

vote the Democratic ticket without any need to fear any reduction in agricultural-commodity tariffs. If it was not intended that the promise should refer specifically to sugar, I do not know why the Democratic committee happened to choose those particular cities in Michigan in which to publish this full-page ad, which happened to be the cities which were in the very heart and center of the sugar-beet areas.

What was this advertisement? It was a full-page advertisement—and this perhaps accounts for some of the party deficit—appearing November 4, 1932, in these Michigan cities, headed "Roosevelt and the Farm Tariff." This is all it said, just a significant and pertinent quotation in big, flaming type, from Governor Roosevelt's speech at Baltimore on October 25, 1932, reading as follows:

Of course, it is absurd to talk of lowering tariff duties on farm products. I declared that all prosperity in the broader sense springs from the soil. I promised to endeavor to restore the purchasing power of the farm dollar by making the tariff effective for agriculture and raising the price of farm products. I know of no excessive high tariff duties on farm products.

That was before he heard from the "brain trust."

I do not intend that any duties necessary to protect the farmer shall be lowered. To do so would be inconsistent with my entire farm program, and every farmer knows it and will not be deceived.

Mr. President, that was pretty plain, and I know, because I happened to be rather prominently engaged in that campaign, how effective that commitment was, and I happen to know that the great beet areas of my State took that at face value as a warrant that there would be no reduction in tariffs upon agricultural commodities in general, and upon sugar in particular. That, furthermore, was the intention.

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

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield, although I do not want to go much further with the political end of this argument. I want to get back to the bill.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Of course the Senator from Michigan is aware that under the so-called "flexible provisions" of the Tariff Act of 1930 it is expected that, upon findings and recommendations of the Tariff Commission which he considers sound, the President of the United States will reduce or increase particular tariff rates, following investigations and reports by the Tariff Commission, within the limits of 50 percent of the tariff duties fixed in the law.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is correct.

Mr. COSTIGAN. And that that result is supposed to follow automatically.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is correct.

Mr. COSTIGAN. May I add, while on my feet, that, of course, I meant not the slightest adverse reflection in any preceding reference to party affiliations. As the Senator obviously understands, I had in view merely this: That a presumption should normally be indulged in favor of a reduced tariff finding under the Tariff Act of 1930, which was enacted under and approved by President Hoover, where the facts have been passed on by a United States Tariff Commission, the majority of the members of which may be assumed to be in accord with the general tariff philosophy of former President Hoover and sympathetic toward the high-tariff tendencies of that law.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I do not know what the appropriate assumptions were in November a year ago. I made several erroneous ones myself. But it strikes me there is no assumption and no implication to be drawn from the cold, hard, unequivocal statement, "Of course, it is absurd to talk of lowering tariff duties on farm products." There is no possible license in that statement for a subsequent reliance upon a collateral report from the Tariff Commission in respect to the net result, and certainly there is no justification for reliance upon a report of the Tariff Commission which, I repeat, is as antiquated as if it had been made a hundred years ago, so long as it is not made in the purview of post-code N.R.A. prices.

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

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. FESS. The question raised by the Senator from Colorado reminds me of the position we on this side of the Chamber took on the flexible-tariff question. When it first

came up it was quite bitterly controverted, not only between the two sides of the Chamber in both Houses, but there was a division on both sides of the aisle in both bodies. That provision gave the authority to the President only upon the finding of an expert commission, after adequate hearings, while what we now are proposing is to avoid any hearings whatever, and not to give to the President power in increase or lower the tariff on behalf of the industry, but to give him a trading point by which he can destroy an industry. If that is not as wide apart from the original plan as are the poles, I do not know of anything that is. When we were giving the President this flexible power, the contention on the part of our friends on the other side of the Chamber was that the power must not be final with the President; that the proposal ought to be returned to the Congress for endorsement or approval before the President can carry it into effect.

I cannot see why the Senator from Colorado should bring into the discussion the item of the flexible tariff bill, under the present situation, in contrast with what we are facing, which is yet to come under the terms of the pending bill.

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

Mr. VANDENBERG. I will yield briefly. I should like to get back to the bill.

Mr. COSTIGAN. In answer to the Senator from Ohio, permit me to say that my observations were made because the Senator from Michigan indicated that the tariff on sugar is to be lowered arbitrarily. The Senator from Michigan subsequently very properly qualified this suggestion by stating that in this instance the so-called "expert" Tariff Commission has found and, according to rumors, has unanimously reported in favor of half a cent reduction per pound in the effective tariff duty on sugar. It is this reduction which the President is now considering ordering, pursuant to law, in response to that official recommendation, as part of the sugar program, offsetting the resulting tendency toward lower prices by the addition of a processing tax of like amount.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, now we are back to that report of the Tariff Commission again, and I must insist upon reasserting that it is as outmoded, as irrelevant, as incompetent and immaterial as if it had been written a century ago, because it deals with pre-code N.R.A. prices and is not entitled to be authoritative in the face of the existing situation. I am sure the great President of the United States, with whom I have been happy to cooperate upon many critical occasions, will take this fact into consideration before he finally acts.

Let me now come to the next fundamental reason why I consider the philosophy at the base of this pending sugar-control bill to have been irrational. Mr. President, it is frankly built upon consideration for Cuba. I do not undertake to say that that is the exclusive or controlling reason, but I say it is one of the major and most effective reasons which have driven the administration into this particular type of sugar control.

I readily concede that under the Platt amendment we owe a certain type of responsibility to Cuba, and since economic and political stability today are so inextricably intertwined perhaps there is also an economic responsibility laid at our doors as the result of the existence of the Platt amendment.

I should like to say in that connection that I most heartily concur in the suggestions of the former able Ambassador to Cuba, Mr. Sumner Welles, now the distinguished Assistant Secretary of State in the present administration—I heartily concur in his recent well-sustained statement that the Platt amendment should be taken out of the Cuban constitution and that Cuba should be left to deal with her own responsibilities in her own way. But that Platt amendment still exists, and, based upon its existence, there is fabricated this theory that we must do something for Cuban sugar. And, I repeat, that is one of the factors that brought this bill.

Mr. President, if there is any obligation on the part of the United States under the Platt amendment to the Republic of Cuba, it is the obligation and the responsibility of all the people of the United States and not the responsi-

bility of just the beet-sugar farmers of the United States. And if there is any debt to be paid to Cuba on this account, it is a debt owing out of the common resources of the whole people of the United States, and it is not a debt that you have any right to charge to the beet-sugar farmers all to themselves. They did not write the Platt amendment. They did not elect to stabilize Cuba under it. They are only a relatively small portion of the population of the United States. If there is any obligation which we owe to Cuba, I repeat, under the Platt amendment, in respect to its economic status, it is an obligation that involves every man, woman, and child under the flag.

Let it be charged where it belongs. Let it not be charged solely against the sugar-beet farmers of the United States.

Furthermore, when you are talking about stabilizing Cuba in respect to sugar, just let me say in passing that at the same time you are stabilizing Cuban sugar you are stabilizing the interests of the National City Bank of New York City, the Chase National Bank of New York City, and Hayden, Stone & Co. of New York City, because they represent, directly or indirectly, at least 50 percent of the financing of Cuban sugar.

If the American beet farmer owes no obligation to Cuba under the Platt amendment, certainly the American farmer owes no obligation to the National City Bank and to the Chase National Bank and to Hayden, Stone & Co. in respect to sugar.

So, I insist that at this point the program is utterly illogical, and that there is no justification in cutting back this cash crop in the United States on any such hypothesis.

These are my principal objections to the bill as it was drawn. I repeat that it has been substantially improved since it was drawn. I think my able friend the senior Senator from Colorado fully shares the belief that the bill had to be amended in many aspects. I am perfectly sure that he would not commit his opinion to the original proposition in its original implications and in its original text. There have been substantial and wholly vital changes. In this aspect we have not fought in vain.

As the bill was drawn in the first instance and submitted to us, this is the threat that confronted us in the initial contemplation of the matter. It left solely and exclusively in the hands of the Secretary of Agriculture the power to do what he pleased with domestic beet and cane sugar, if, when, and as he might see fit to write its life or death warrant. This sugar commissar, who had been obviously skeptical, to use a very mild word, respecting the utility of our sugar industry, was to have the power of life and death over it, without any restriction or limitation. Meanwhile, the President's message had suggested, as a prospective quota rule, that continental beets be reduced as much as 300,000 tons to a production of not more than 1,400,000 tons. But the decision was wholly in the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture.

There was a far-reaching change made in that aspect of the thing as the result of common effort on both sides of the aisle, and common conference at both ends of the Capitol. We finally wrote a clause into the bill which specifically prohibits the reduction of the domestic beet quota below 1,550,000 tons. Thus we not only escaped the unlimited jurisdiction of the Secretary but also won a larger recognition, by 100,000 tons, than the President's message had proposed to grant.

This total of 1,550,000 tons sounds like a great deal of sugar, but it is 200,000 tons less of sugar than was produced in these continental beet areas last year, and if the Secretary shall use this minimum provided in the bill when he writes the quotas for the sugar industry of the United States, if he uses this figure of 1,550,000 tons, he probably decrees the destruction of several sugar mills in the United States, and he decrees the sterility, enforced and arbitrary sterility, of many an agricultural acre in the United States. But it is infinitely better than it was when we had no protection at all. It is better than no bill, if we are to have a reduction in the sugar tariff.

I sought in the first instance, speaking for myself, to make this limitation 2,000,000 tons, which represents our continental sugar-beet capacity. That having failed, I sought to make it 1,750,000 tons, which was last year's production. That having failed, we finally came together upon this 1,550,000 tons. That was in the bill when it passed the House.

May I say for the House also that it very wisely struck another section from the original bill which would have given this new sugar dictator in the Department of Agriculture the right, upon his own authority, to control not only sugar upon the American farm but every other product in connection and in respect thereto. Except as that provision had been stricken from the bill it would have been possible for this sugar dictator to say to a farmer of Michigan that he could not have any sugar benefits unless he was willing to agree to stop milking his cows and shearing his sheep. It would have put the farmer totally and absolutely in all aspects under the domination of the sugar dictator. Mr. President, the other House struck out that provision, and they did a good job when they did it.

The House thought that they did something else; they thought they guaranteed domestic sugar 30 percent of any increased consumption in the United States. What they thought they had agreed to was 30 percent of the increased consumption over and above 6,452,000 tons of sugar, which was the consumption in the United States last year. In other words, the amendment which had been injected into the bill as a result of our—shall we say gentlemen's agreement—as a result of the instructions which were given the drafting clerks of the Department of Agriculture, contemplated the assurance to us of 30 percent of the new consumption in excess of 6,452,000 tons. This was vital. The bill presumably passed the House in that form. After it reached the Senate, and the language had been put under a microscope, it developed that the provision which the House had adopted presumably guaranteeing us 30 percent of the increased consumption, namely, 30 percent of the consumption in excess of 6,452,000 tons, actually permitted the Secretary of Agriculture to estimate the consumption this year, and then to give us 30 percent of the consumption in excess of his estimate. In other words, all in the world he had to do was to boost the estimate a little bit and our 30 percent would not be worth the paper on which it was written. The amendment actually foreclosed us from participation in any share of this increased consumption. I do not call it a joker, but I do call it a most devastating mistake.

I want to say for the Senator from Colorado [Mr. COSTIGAN]—because there is no disagreement between us at any time of the day or night in respect to the good faith with which he and I deal with each other and with this bill—that the Senator from Colorado was just as unwilling to permit that clause to stand as was I or anybody else. So the Senate committee changed that clause, and we now have a warrant for a minimum of 30 percent of the increased consumption in the United States over 6,452,000 tons. That is calculated to be of immense value.

The Senate committee did some other things to improve the situation and make it a little more palatable. In the bill as drawn, as it came to us from the other House, there existed authority in the Secretary of Agriculture to fix a minimum wage in the beet fields upon the beet farms in the United States, a privilege in respect to minimum wages respecting farm commodities which does not exist under any other section of the triple A act, and which has never heretofore been sought. We have never yet sought to fix farm wages.

There has been considerable misunderstanding about this minimum-wage amendment. It does not involve, Mr. President, the contemplation which is ordinarily involved in minimum-wage proposals in industry. I heartily favor minimum-wage proposals in industry. But here is a situation where the farmer's minimum wage may again be the factor that will control the question of whether or not he can remain in the sugar-beet business.

He cannot control the price he gets for his beets; he cannot control the revenue from his operations in respect to this industry. He is dependent, first, upon the retail price of sugar; he is dependent, second, upon his contracts with his processor. If there shall not be enough left after that to reimburse him for his cost of production, it is just too bad; there is not any place for him to get any more. Therefore, if we were to leave in the Secretary of Agriculture the power to fix the minimum wage in respect to beet-sugar production, we would leave with him the power by the simple fixing of an inimical figure absolutely to drive out of production every beet farmer in the United States. It was an utterly insufferable situation which had to be changed, and it was changed by the committee. The average labor cost per acre of sugar beets in the United States is, I believe, about \$13. The Labor Department would like to fix it at not less than \$20. But that would take away most of the cash benefits to beet farmers contemplated by this plan, because it is part of the plan that the retail price of sugar cannot be raised. This labor-cost increase may well be a problem in reform tomorrow. It manifestly cannot be part of a farm-relief program today.

I am not going to take the Senate's time to go into the other amendments that were made. They were important, and they bear upon the question of whether or not we can reluctantly accept this bill. I think if I had been in the other House and had been there confronted upon a roll call by the bill as it was there tendered, I would have voted, as did most of my Republican colleagues from Michigan, against the bill. I am not so sure now, Mr. President, in the face of all the improvements that have been made in the proposed legislation, in the face of what I believe to be a decided change in the attitude of the Department itself respecting sugar, and in the face of the letter which has just been submitted at the desk from the authenticated representatives and spokesmen of the Michigan sugar industry from both farm and factory—I am not sure that they would not join me now in reluctantly voting for the proposed legislation.

But, Mr. President, I must repeat that this is an amazing contemplation with which to be confronted in an amendment to the Agricultural Adjustment Act. We do not get the benefit of a processing tax under this bill *de novo*; we do not get it as a development in constructive marketing attention in behalf of the industry. Why do we get it? We get it only as an offset to a tariff reduction, and we can only have so much as may be measured by whatever tariff reduction shall be made.

Mr. President, I submit again that there is utterly no logic in such a program, and that it is, indeed, a desperate situation which drives us to have any hospitality for such a formula.

I want to add, before it escapes my memory, that another amendment ought to be added to the pending bill on the Senate floor—an amendment to provide the necessary Federal funds to take the domestic sugar carry-over of 300,000 tons off the current market so that the new system may have a maximum chance to function effectively, if this be possible.

In conclusion, I want to point out that there are one or two administrative hazards left, and we may as well face them frankly. There still remains the hazard which is inherent in the necessary subdivision of the continental quota between factories in the 16 or 17 beet-sugar-producing States of the Union. That power rests in the Secretary. If that power be exercised on the basis of the 3-year averages, it may well prove to be a power which will be unfair and fatal to the beet producers and the sugar mills in the eastern area. Why? Because during the depression the mills in the eastern area were down and quiet and silent in far greater degree than were the mills in the western area. For example, in 1931-32, 35 out of 35 factories were operating in the Rocky Mountain territory, but only 7 out of 20 factories were operating in the Michigan, Ohio, Indiana, and Wisconsin territory. Therefore, manifestly, any reliance upon a 3-year average in the redivision of this

continental quota would be utterly unfair to the eastern area. I wish to make it plain here and now that I shall protest as long and as loudly as I can, not only in this forum but in the subsequent administrative forum, against any such division in the continental quota on a basis which is unfair to the eastern area.

I tried to get an amendment into the bill which would have been directory in character and which would have instructed the Secretary of Agriculture to maintain, so far as practicable, the existing acreage status by way of the relationship in respect to the sugar acreage East and West as it exists today and as it existed in last year's acreage; but we were utterly unable to agree upon the formula, and therefore that particular hazard is left open.

There is one other hazard, Mr. President, to which no one need close his eyes. If the Secretary of Agriculture shall put continental beets upon the basis of a quota of 1,550,000 tons, he will have stricken down 200,000 tons of production as measured by last year's figures. In the sugar-beet business that reduction of about 12 percent cannot be spread horizontally over the entire area and over the entire production. What it may be necessary to do is to put it all in one place. The reduction cannot be spread horizontally so as to have a number of factories working at less than an efficiency peak; it may be essential to put all the contraction into one factory and into one community around that factory. So, as I view the situation, unless the Secretary of Agriculture shall liberalize this minimum quota which has been set for him in the proposed law, he will be responsible for closing certain factories in the United States completely and for decimating certain acreages completely. I desire to repeat that the whole subject under the terms of this bill is entirely and exclusively in his control. This proposed law will not force him to close one single factory; this proposed law will not force him to deny one single contract for beets with one single farmer. The Secretary can make it possible if he has the vision, he can make it possible if he has the will, for all these factories to operate and for all the farmers again to grow beets.

The decision is squarely up to him. The country has a right to hold him responsible for the decision which may be made. He is an honest, earnest, conscientious official. I do not despair of his further and final conversion to our viewpoint.

Now, just a word in conclusion. Since so much is going to depend upon the attitude and the decision of the Secretary of Agriculture, in this respect, I think it is rather important that the record should be sufficiently complete to illuminate him in respect to the task which he confronts. I want to point out to him solemnly that this is the first time in the history of governments, since the specific days of Frederick the Great in Germany and Napoleon in France, that any government has proposed to turn backward in respect to the development and encouragement of the sugar-beet industry.

Lamartine said that history teaches everything, and I think that history teaches something in respect to the statement I have just made.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield—

Mr. VANDENBERG. Certainly.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Comte said the only thing we learn from history is that we cannot learn from history.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I have heard that, too, and I am hoping against hope that the Senator from Minnesota has not described the "brain trust" when it gets ready to administer this bill.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President—

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

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. The Senator made the statement that this is the first time in history that any effort has been made to reduce the production of beet sugar or to discourage that industry. I wish to know if he would make the same statement with reference to cane sugar?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I am not familiar with the history of cane sugar, and therefore I cannot make the statement; but the cane-sugar factor in the present situation which I am discussing is utterly secondary, with great respect to the State of Louisiana, to the beet-sugar factor, because in the latter factor is involved 1,750,000 tons of production, whereas in the former factor only 260,000 tons of production is involved.

I want to point out that ever since Napoleon discovered that Frederick William III in Germany had successfully experimented with sugar beets there has been just one sugar trend in the world, and that is a forward march in respect to its culture and encouragement. Napoleon discovered, after 10 years of experimental work, not only that France could raise beets but that beet crops were the most valuable collateral corollary crop a farmer could have because of its service and value to the soil.

Within 2 years after Napoleon had initiated the experiment in France he had 334 small beet-sugar factories operating in that land. Napoleon's action marked the beginning of a new and important epoch in the history of the sugar industry. The Governments of Germany, Austria-Hungary, Belgium, the Netherlands, Russia, and other European countries soon began to encourage the establishment and development of the industry, with the result that prior to the outbreak of the World War over 1,200 immense beet-sugar factories were scattered over Europe, producing over 9,000,000 tons of sugar annually, or about one half of the world's supply.

The first successful attempt to grow sugar beets in the United States for sugar-making purposes was in the vicinity of Philadelphia in 1836. The first beet-sugar factory was erected in Northampton, Mass., in 1838, and in the following year this factory produced 1,300 pounds of sugar. No further efforts were made to establish the beet-sugar industry in this country until 1852, when the Mormons of Utah conceived the idea of erecting a beet-sugar factory to supply their own requirements. This undertaking was a striking illustration of the difficulties encountered by the pioneers in the beet-sugar industry. The machinery for the factory was purchased in France and transported in a sailing vessel across the Atlantic and up the Mississippi River to Leavenworth, Kans., whence it was hauled by ox team all the way from Kansas to Utah, a distance of over 1,000 miles.

From 1852 to 1879, 12 beet-sugar factories were erected in this country—5 in California, 2 in Illinois, 2 in Wisconsin, and 1 each in Maine, Massachusetts, and Delaware.

In 1897, however, Congress wisely decided to follow the lead of European governments and establish a definite policy of protection to the domestic sugar industry, with a view to making the United States independent of foreign countries for its sugar supply. With this change of attitude on the part of the Government, capital began to flow into the domestic beet-sugar industry, and by 1903 the number of factories had increased from 6 to 39, while the production of sugar had increased from 45,000 tons in 1896 to 240,000 tons, or over 400 percent in 6 years.

Mr. President, today there are 102 beet-sugar factories erected in this country, located in 17 States, some of them the largest and finest in the world. During the early stages of development of the industry in this country the daily beet-sugar capacity of the plants had averaged from 10 to 60 tons. After the industry had become fairly well established, most of the factories erected had a daily slicing capacity of from 300 to 350 tons of beets. The average daily slicing capacity of the 102 factories now in existence is approximately 1,000 tons, while one of these, the largest beet-sugar factory in the world, has an average daily slicing capacity of 4,500 tons of beets.

The total production of domestic beet sugar increased from 45,000 tons in 1896 to over 1,000,000 tons in 1927, valued at over \$120,000,000, the proceeds from the sale of which all revert to American labor and American industry, and that production had risen, I remind the Senate again, to 1,750,000 tons in 1934.

From start to finish it is a progressive record of development, and I repeat that no government since the days of Frederick in Germany and Napoleon in France has ever turned its back on this industry and has ever done anything else save to encourage its expansion. This hour is the first time in all its history that it has been proposed deliberately to cut back sugar-beet production. I must confess, Mr. President, that when it is done on the false theory and assumption that this is an "inefficient", "unnecessarily expensive" industry, although it produces sugar cheaper than it is sold in any other place beneath the stars with four exceptions, I cannot subscribe to that philosophy, and I can go along with the adventure only because, in the face of baneful alternatives, I choose the lesser of evils.

This is what I would do with the sugar industry if I had a right to write the program: First, I would allow the continental production to be whatever it could be by the natural law. I would not apply a restriction to it within the continental United States at all.

Second, I would put quota limitations upon external sugar raised under the flag, dealing necessarily on a special basis with Hawaii in this connection.

Third, I would provide a sliding-scale tariff which would take the sugar-tariff question out of Congress and out of our economics for keeps, a sliding-scale sugar tariff in which the rate would go up when the price went down and the rate would go down when the price went up. Under that sort of program I would hope and expect there might be developed still further the agrarian prosperity that resides in the successful and prosperous sugar-beet industry.

But, Mr. President, that is not the program that impends. The program before us is in the bill which I have dissected at far greater length than I had anticipated when I rose. My position upon it is clearly obvious. My conclusion in respect to it is the conclusion submitted in the letter which was read from the desk, submitted by the authenticated and authoritative spokesman for the beet farmers and the beet processors of the State of Michigan.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield before he takes his seat?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. FESS. I desire to ask the Senator just one question. Assuming that this measure will pass, what relief will it afford against the pending legislation in reference to bargaining tariffs, if that should pass?

Mr. VANDENBERG. No relief whatever.

Mr. FESS. That is my understanding.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is simply a pyramided hazard which we shall have to confront when we reach it.

Mr. OVERTON obtained the floor.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Mr. President, when the Senator from Michigan referred to this proposed legislation as the first effort to restrict domestic production, did he have in mind the voluntary stabilization agreement much discussed last fall by continental sugar interests?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I did not have it in mind, but it does not conflict in any degree, if I understand the situation, because I think the voluntary stabilization agreement to which the Senator refers contemplated a quota of 1,750,000 tons for the continental United States, which was a maintenance of the existing status. Am I correct in that? If I am, it seems to me that the Senator but proves my point.

Mr. COSTIGAN. It contemplated a domestic beet-sugar quota of 1,750,000 tons; and this year we have found in the beet-sugar "bag", as sugar men say, 1,756,000 tons of sugar. In other words, the much-praised stabilization agreement to which the Senator has referred would itself, in fact, have resulted in a restriction of last year's domestic production of beet sugar. It is a trivial difference, to be sure, but it illustrates the principle.

Mr. VANDENBERG. According to the Senator's statement—and I have no purpose to quarrel with him—the stabilization agreement would have curtailed this year's production by 6,000 tons, whereas the pending bill contemplates a curtailment of 200,000 tons.

Mr. President, I shall hope for the best when this legislation gets to work. I prayerfully commend a review of the whole subject to the President and his Secretary of Agriculture before any sugar-tariff protection is withdrawn and before any quota restrictions shall stunt beet-sugar culture in the continental United States.

Mr. President, during the course of his earnest discussion—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] has been recognized.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Pardon me; I did not hear that done.

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

Mr. OVERTON. Certainly.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I desire to comment briefly on an exchange of views between the Senator from Michigan and myself. Will the Senator from Louisiana yield for that purpose?

Mr. OVERTON. Yes; I yield, gladly.

Mr. COSTIGAN. During the course of the earnest discussion of the Senator from Michigan reference was made by him to so-called "compulsory support" of the pending measure by beet farmers of Michigan. Confirming what I then stated, and in further support of my contention that the endorsement of the pending measure in Michigan, no less than in the trans-Mississippi west, by beet farmers is voluntary and not compulsory, I wish to read two or three extracts from letters in my possession, written by Mr. E. O. Compton, president of the Mount Clemens Sugar Beet Growers' Association, with headquarters at Mount Clemens, Mich.

Mr. Compton, with whom I am not personally acquainted, on March 3, 1934, wrote me in part as follows:

Since June 15, 1933, I have been engaged in making applications to the Federal land bank for mortgages held by 17 banks and 1 trust company in 3 counties. Due to my farm activities the Macomb County Bankers' Association selected me to assist the farmers in making out their applications to the Federal land bank, the banks paying the expense, also the necessary appraisal fee, so you may readily see that I have had an extensive contact with the farmers of this community, and I would honestly say that the general opinion is that the present administration is making it possible for these farmers to keep their farms, reducing their interest rates, and in a great many cases a large percentage of their entire obligation, and they feel grateful as well as obligated, and stand by ready to accept any program that might be advanced by our President.

Attached to the letter from which I have read, received from Mr. Compton, was a copy of another letter written on February 27, 1934, by Mr. Compton as president of the Mount Clemens Sugar Beet Growers' Association, in which he said:

At the present time I am president of the Mount Clemens Sugar Beet Growers' Association. Also secretary and treasurer of the Michigan, Ohio, and Indiana Beet Growers' Association. These associations are beet growers' associations, consisting of the farmers who actually grow sugar beets in the States of Michigan, Ohio, and Indiana.

Since the sugar-quota plan has been advanced by the President I have had an occasion to talk personally with over 200 local beet growers, and I have not found one of them who is opposed to working out a plan that would benefit all people concerned in relation to the sugar business of this State. I also personally know that the telegrams and letters that you have received from this locality from various beet growers have been sent by men who were selected to send these communications by the owners of the sugar mills of this State. I am sorry to state that these telegrams and requests do not truly reflect the feeling that exists in the rank and file of the beet growers of these States but are only a group of men who are closely allied with the mill owners.

I could go into a lengthy discussion as to what has happened in this State in regard to the growing of sugar beets for the last 15 years, but I feel sure that you have at hand probably more information than I could give you, but the following statement could be easily proven and might be of interest to you:

A group of not exceeding six or seven men operated directly or indirectly 14 of the sugar mills of this State last year with a net earning of between three and four million dollars, while 80 percent of the farmers who delivered beets to these factories, after receiving their \$4 advance payment, did not have sufficient funds to pay the field labor, seed, fertilizer, and trucking expense entailed by the delivery of the beets to the mill, and are compelled under the present existing contracts to wait until September 1, 1934, to receive payment on crops which were planted in April of 1933.

I have been president of the Mount Clemens Sugar Beet Growers' Association 2 years and secretary and treasurer of the Michigan, Ohio, and Indiana Beet Growers' Association for 2 years, own and operate my own farm of 260 acres at Mount Clemens, Mich., so I may be termed a "true dirt farmer".

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, after the very able, interesting, and illuminating discussion of the sugar bill by both the Senator from Colorado [Mr. COSTIGAN] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], not only as to its details but as to its general aspects, I expect this afternoon to confine my remarks regarding the bill largely to an amendment which I think should be adopted.

I realize that it is extremely difficult to prepare a bill on a subject where there are so many conflicting interests as there are in the sugar industry. I think the committees of the House and of the Senate, and the Senators from States interested in the sugar industry, are to be congratulated upon the painstaking, industrious, patient, and able handling of this measure.

The bill is perhaps not entirely satisfactory to any one Representative or to any one Senator from a State interested in the sugar industry. It is an attempt to reconcile differences that exist between continental producers of sugar in the United States, if there are any conflicts of interest between domestic producing areas. It is also an attempt to reconcile, as far as possible, conflicting interests in the production of sugar in the mainland of the United States and in our insular possessions and areas. It is also an attempt to adjust the sugar industry with respect to world conditions as they exist today.

Representing in part the State of Louisiana, which is the third largest sugar-producing State in the Union, there are some provisions of the bill which I should like to see altered. There is one amendment in particular which I should like to have adopted. With the adoption of that amendment, notwithstanding that the bill is not entirely satisfactory to myself as representing one of the big sugar-producing areas in the United States, I expect to vote for the bill.

The bill as reported by the Senate Committee on Finance contains an amendment, to be found on page 11, section 4, paragraph (D). The bill as passed by the House authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to "establish a separate quota or quotas for edible molasses and/or for sirup or cane juice produced in continental United States, in addition to the quotas established pursuant to paragraphs (A) and (B)."

The purpose of that provision, as I understand it, was to enact that a separate quota may be established by the Secretary of Agriculture for the production of edible molasses and cane sirup in continental United States that would be in addition to the quotas which are assigned in other portions of the bill for continental United States production.

Sugar is defined in the bill as follows:

The term "sugar" means sugar in any form whatsoever, derived from sugar beets or sugar cane, whether raw sugar or direct-consumption sugar, including also edible molasses, sirups, and any mixture containing sugar (except blackstrap molasses and beet molasses).

Therefore, under this definition of sugar, a quota assigned would include edible molasses, sirup, and any mixture containing sugar. Hence the bill as passed by the House provides that the Secretary of Agriculture shall have authority to establish a separate quota for cane sirup and edible molasses produced in continental United States.

The Senate Committee on Finance has amended paragraph (D), on page 11, to which I have referred, by inserting therein the words "and/or for edible molasses, sirups, and sugar mixtures", not simply in addition to but "as part of." Therefore, under the Senate committee amendment, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to establish a separate quota for edible molasses, sirups, and sugar mixtures either as a part of or in addition to the quotas established under the bill.

Hence, as far as Louisiana and Florida are concerned, which go largely into the manufacture of cane sirups and edible molasses, the edible molasses and cane sirup produced in those two States can, in the discretion of the Secretary

of Agriculture, be considered as constituting a part of their quota of 260,000 tons.

Not only that, but, according to my view, it upsets the quotas which are established by the bill for off-shore sugar, because it permits the Secretary to establish an additional quota for all off-shore sugar, or additional quotas for that kind of sugar which will consist of edible molasses, sirups, and sugar mixtures. Therefore, the Philippine Islands, or Cuba, or Hawaii, may enjoy the quota that is contemplated in the President's message, and, in addition to that, there may be assigned to them quotas for edible molasses and for cane sirup and for sugar mixtures to be brought into the United States, which edible molasses and cane sirup can, after being brought into the United States, be manufactured into sugar proper, and therefore increase their quotas.

Mr. President, at the proper time I intend to offer an amendment to correct what I consider a defect in the bill in reference not only to Louisiana and Florida cane sirup and edible molasses, because those can be included under this amendment in the quotas assigned to that cane-producing area, but also in order to prevent an increase in the quotas of off-shore sugar.

The Senator from Michigan and the Senator from Colorado, in their very able remarks in respect to this measure, have dealt almost exclusively with beet sugar. I wish to make some observations with respect to cane sugar and its production in Louisiana.

Louisiana today is not only the third largest producing sugar State in the Union but it is also the pioneer State in the sugar industry. The Senator from Michigan in his remarks referred to the fact that not since the days of Napoleon and of Frederick the Great had there been any effort, until this bill was introduced, to discourage the sugar industry. I may say, by way of parentheses, that I did not look upon this bill as an effort to discourage the sugar industry. I look upon it as an effort on the part of the Department of Agriculture, its Secretary and its experts, and on the part of the members of the different committees in the House and in the Senate who had this bill in charge to undertake to stabilize this industry, because of the unfortunate condition in which it finds itself.

I do not think it is the purpose of the Secretary of Agriculture to discourage the production of sugar on the mainland of the United States. I think the Secretary of Agriculture, when he undertakes to administer the bill, will have in mind the statement contained in the bill as to the policy of the measure in respect to the sugar industry. That policy is declared in section 4, as follows:

Sec. 4. Section 8 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"Sec. 8a. (1) Having due regard to the welfare of domestic producers and to the protection of domestic consumers and to a just relation between the prices received by domestic producers and the prices paid by domestic consumers, the Secretary of Agriculture may, in order to effectuate the declared policy of this act, from time to time, by orders or regulations"—

And so forth.

Therefore, Mr. President, the declared policy of the bill, the main policy of the bill, as set forth in the paragraph which I have just quoted, is to maintain due regard to the welfare of domestic producers of sugar in the United States, as well as a due regard for the welfare of consumers, and a just relation between the prices received by domestic producers and the prices paid by domestic consumers.

As I started to say a moment ago, the sugar industry is an old industry in the State of Louisiana. We were producing sugar in Louisiana commercially right after the American Revolution. Sugarcane was introduced into Louisiana long before the American Revolution. In spite of difficulties and in spite of obstacles, it has grown and developed through the years. It is an industry around which the economic life and the industrial life of all the southern portions of the State of Louisiana revolve. It is an industry upon which very largely has been built the business of the great port of New Orleans.

I have stated that this bill was not completely satisfactory to Louisiana producers, Louisiana manufacturers, and Louisiana refiners. The quota assigned to Louisiana and Florida is 260,000 tons, but Louisiana normally produces over 300,000 tons of sugar.

I wish to read into the RECORD statistics covering the years when the yield in the State of Louisiana was in excess of 300,000 short tons of raw sugar.

In 1907-8 Louisiana produced 394,240 short tons; in 1908-9, 414,400; in 1909-10, 375,200; in 1910-11, 355,040; in 1911-12, 360,874; in 1913-14, 300,537; in 1916-17, 310,900; in 1921-22, 324,429.

It was about the time of the World War, Mr. President, that the Federal Government, undertaking certain experiments in reference to the production of sugarcane in the State of Louisiana, imported certain varieties of cane into that State which were subsequently found to be infected with what is known as the "mosaic disease." That cane was planted in different areas of the Sugar Bowl of Louisiana, and it gradually resulted in an infection of the sugarcane of Louisiana.

As the result of this mosaic disease, sugarcane production in Louisiana dropped down until in 1926-27 we produced only 47,165 tons. But the Federal Government has aided us in introducing new varieties of cane into Louisiana that are disease resisting. We are planting that cane, and as a result we are gradually getting out of the difficulty in which we found ourselves by reason of the abnormal decrease in production growing out of the infection of our sugarcane by mosaic disease, so that in recent years we have been getting back to normalcy.

In 1930-31 we produced 210,094 tons of raw sugar; in 1931-32, 180,239; in 1932-33, 222,760; in 1933-34 we have produced, according to the latest authentic figures, 214,455 and not 208,000, as usually quoted.

It is estimated that during the year 1934-35 we shall produce somewhere between 230,000 and 257,000 short tons, or, in other words, approximately 240,000 tons.

I wish in this connection, Mr. President, to send to the desk a letter from Mr. Reginald Dykers, vice president and general manager of the American Sugar Cane League, under date of April 10, 1934, addressed to Secretary Wallace, giving the actual production of sugar in Louisiana during the last season, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD immediately following the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COUZENS in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. OVERTON. Florida has been increasing her production of sugar. The sugar industry was established in Florida in comparatively very recent years. She produced something over 40,000 short tons during the year 1933-34; possibly as high as 50,000 tons. In 1932-33 she produced 36,000 short tons.

Statistics show that the average production in the State of Louisiana during the pre-war basic period was something over 330,000 tons. When, therefore, we take the production of Louisiana in normal times of, say, 330,000 tons a year, and add thereto the production of Florida of something like 50,000 tons, we have about 380,000 tons annual production for both States. I think I can state conservatively that there is during normal production an annual yield in this sugarcane area in the United States of well over 360,000 short tons of raw sugar.

Yet, Mr. President, I stand here, representing in part the sugarcane producing area of the United States, and state that under all the circumstances, considering all the difficulties surrounding this bill, I am willing to accept, so far as I am personally concerned, the assigned quota of 260,000 short tons.

I would have much preferred that a separate quota be assigned to Louisiana and a separate quota be assigned to Florida, but I know that if that suggestion were made, and if that suggestion were acted upon, the States producing

beet sugar would want separate quotas assigned to them. Colorado, California, and Michigan would all come in and ask for separate quotas, and we would be thrown into hopeless confusion.

So, Mr. President, I am not going to make any fight in reference to the quota which has been assigned to Louisiana and Florida, and I am not, under the circumstances, going to undertake to have those two States divided into separate areas.

I think the great difficulty that is confronting the sugar industry in the continental United States is due to the vast increase of production in our insular areas. According to the United States Tariff Commission, the 1919 production in the insular areas of Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Philippine Islands was only 1,237,000 short tons. Of those 1,237,000 tons there was brought into the United States 84.2 percent. But in 1932, 13 years later, this production of sugar in our insular areas had increased from 1,237,000 short tons to 3,124,000 short tons, or practically three times the quantity produced in 1919. The ratio of receipts into the mainland of the United States to production in the insular areas had risen to 94.8 percent as compared with 84.2 percent in 1919.

Breaking down those figures somewhat, we have this interesting information: The Philippine Islands increased their production during the same period, from 1919 to 1932, from 219,000 short tons to 1,102,000 short tons and increased their percentage of imports into the United States of their production from 40.2 percent to 94.4 percent; in other words, their production has multiplied more than five times, and the ratio of their imports into the United States to their production has been more than doubled.

During the same period Puerto Rico has increased her production from 400,000 short tons to 992,000 short tons. Hawaii has increased her production from 602,000 tons to 1,025,000 tons. While during this same period, from 1919 to 1932, continental production has increased less than 100 percent, the insular production has increased approximately 200 percent, while during the same period continental production has increased less than 1,000,000 tons, insular production has increased approximately 2,000,000 short tons.

Mr. President, when I consider those figures, when I contemplate the advantage which these insular and offshore areas enjoy in the growing and in the manufacture and in the refining of sugar by reason of their climatic conditions as well as the fertility of their soil, and by reason of the cheapness of their labor, both in field and in factory, and when I realize that this tremendous increase in production in the insular areas has resulted in an enormous increase during recent years in the importations into the mainland of the United States duty free of sugar, both raw and refined, coming into competition with American growers of continental United States, and coming into competition with the laborers both in the field and in the factory, if I had my way about it in respect to this bill, I am frank to say that I would undertake to protect, first and foremost, and to encourage first and foremost, the production and growing of sugar in the continental United States by the continental farmer and its manufacture and its refining by American labor. If I had my way about it, I think the theory of the bill that I would propose would be for the Secretary of Agriculture to estimate annually the consumption requirements of the continental United States—and the pending bill relates to consumption requirements in continental United States—then to estimate what would be produced by the American growers in continental United States, deduct that amount from the consumption requirements, and distribute the residue as quotas for offshore importation and induction of sugar.

However, as I stated in the beginning of my remarks, I know that we are brought face to face with very perplexing problems; we are brought face to face with certain facts, various conflicting interests, various ideas and theories and thoughts upon this question, and I think perhaps, after

all, considering all these grave difficulties, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. COSTIGAN] and the Finance Committee of the Senate have brought out about as workable a bill as in this year of our Lord 1934 can be framed and enacted into law, subject, of course, Mr. President, to the amendments which I have suggested in the beginning of my remarks.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Mr. President—

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

Mr. OVERTON. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The able Senator from Louisiana, of course, recognizes that in dealing with the problem of offshore sugar, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and even the Philippines for historic or constitutional reasons, regard themselves as being part of the United States, and that some qualification must be allowed in completing a legislative program of this sort on that account?

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I realize that fact, and I realize that they are American citizens; that they are under the American flag. I realize that they have certain natural advantages that we do not possess here on the mainland in reference to climatic conditions that are peculiarly conducive to the production of sugar. I also realize—and I made the same comment the other day in dealing with the excise tax on oils brought into the United States—that the American capital that goes into those insular areas to exploit them for their own benefit and for their own aggrandizement ought not to undertake to pay mere subsistence wages to their laborers who are willing or forced to live in grass huts, who are willing to clothe themselves with a loin cloth, and whose standards of living are far below what we have here in the United States and what we hope to maintain in the continental United States. When I realize that the people in those insular areas, so far as the record goes, are apparently willing to submit themselves to such conditions, to being underpaid as laborers, to being underfed, to being underclad, resulting in a cheap production of commodities that come into competition with the products of the American farmer and the American laborer and the American manufacturer; when I realize that the situation thus brought about produces a conflict between the interests of those insular areas and the interests of continental United States and that the farmers and laborers of the continental United States are not responsible at all for that condition, and where that conflict is irreconcilable and I have got to make the choice, I am going to take my stand with the farmer in these United States of America; I am going to take my stand with the laborer in the continental United States.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will my colleague yield to me?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Mr. President, will the Senator first permit me to ask a question of his colleague?

Mr. LONG. Yes.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The junior Senator from Louisiana, of course, recognizes that the primary purpose of this bill is to give assurance of living minimum returns to the American producers of sugar?

Mr. OVERTON. I realize that.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the junior Senator from Louisiana yield to his colleague?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield to the senior Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. I merely want to suggest to my friend from Colorado, as well as to my colleague, that this is not entirely a fight between the insular interests and our own interests. As a matter of fact the same interests in America would be perfectly willing to depress the status of our local sugar grower to where he would be no more than a peasant like the Filipino. They would like to see the industry reduced to a slave basis. They would have no objection whatever to having the same peasantry exist among our own people that there is among the Filipinos.

Mr. OVERTON. I think my colleague, the senior Senator from Louisiana, makes a very correct observation.

That was the thought I was trying in my feeble way to convey to the Senate, depicting at least what my reaction is to the situation and my attitude and my view.

Mr. President, I do not wish the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. COSTIGAN] to think that in these reflections I am making any invidious comments or observations with reference to the bill which has been under his particular and very able and very conscientious care. I know that he has just as much interest as I have, in a representative capacity, in the production of sugar in the continental United States.

Mr. President, passing for a moment from that phase of the subject, the President has stated in his message that—

The annual gross value of the sugar crop to the American beet and cane growers is approximately \$60,000,000. Those who believe in the further importation of sugar say the 2-cents-per-pound tariff is levied mostly to protect the \$60,000,000 crop and that it costs our consuming public every year more than \$200,000,000 to afford this protection.

I am not going to take issue with the President in respect to the figures he has given; but in speaking of the annual gross value of the sugar crop he refers to the gross value to the growers and not to the industry as a whole in the United States. After the sugar leaves the field, either in the form of cane or in the form of beets, it goes to the factory and is processed, and that gives employment to thousands upon thousands of laborers.

To go hastily through this phase of the question, if we figure the manufactured price of sugar at, say, 4 cents per pound, which would be \$80 a short ton, and realize that we are producing here in the United States approximately 2,000,000 short tons, we find we have a gross yield of \$160,000,000 in the continental United States instead of \$60,000,000 as stated by the President.

If we go further and adopt the suggestion thrown out by the able Senator from Colorado [Mr. COSTIGAN], which in a large sense is a proper one, and take into consideration the value to other American citizens of this industry in Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Philippine Islands, we have a production of 3,000,000 more short tons in those insular areas, making a total American production of 5,000,000 tons, which, at \$80 a ton, brings the gross yield of \$400,000,000 to the American interests in the production and manufacture of sugar.

Mr. President, there is another thing to consider when we come to estimate the cost of this industry. Sugar has been steadily yielding us a revenue through customs duties. It has been producing practically one fourth of the total customs receipts of the United States. I send to the desk and ask to have incorporated in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a statement showing the tariff revenues derived from sugar and the tariff revenues derived from all imports into the United States from the year 1929 to the year 1933, both inclusive.

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

The statement is as follows:

*Tariff revenues, computed on total imports*

Year <sup>1</sup>	Sugar	All imports	Percent
1929	\$129,526,461	\$584,772,212	22+
1930	115,121,253	461,885,516	24+
1931	98,329,067	370,770,650	26+
1932	74,156,781	259,599,770	28+
1933	65,589,596	288,157,787	23+

<sup>1</sup> Calendar year.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, in addition to the fact that sugar normally yields us as a revenue producer something over \$100,000,000 a year, in addition to the consideration that it yields approximately one fourth of our total tariff revenue, it is to be borne in mind that if we were to repeal the customs duties on the importation of foreign sugar we would have to resort to some other form of taxation in order to supply the deficiency resulting from that repeal.

But we are not the only country that imposes a revenue tariff on sugar. In a great many other countries there is not only imposed a tariff upon the importation of sugar, but there is imposed a consumption tax because sugar is regarded as being one of the best revenue producers of all commodities. In Italy there is a tariff of 2.75 cents per pound and a consumption tax of 9.07 cents per pound. In France there is a tariff of 2.94 cents per pound and a consumption tax of 1.12 cents per pound. In Poland there is a tariff of 4.58 cents per pound and a consumption tax of 7 cents per pound. In Austria there is a tariff of 2.35 cents per pound and a consumption tax of 1.85 cents per pound. These figures are taken from the sugar reference book and directory for 1932-33 and relate to raw sugar.

As a matter of fact, Mr. President, in spite of the fact that we have a tariff on sugar, sugar is about as cheap as any food consumed in the United States. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] has read into the RECORD figures showing the prices of sugar as retailed in different countries of Europe, Africa, and Asia. Those figures show that the cost of sugar to the housewife in continental United States is approximately one half what it is to the housewife in Europe. Those figures show that the retail price of sugar in continental United States is less than in any other country except England, Denmark, Japan, and Java. The prices in those countries are around 4 cents per pound, practically the same as in the United States.

It has been stated, and I presume it is correct, that if based on the ratio of calory contents and value of food calories contained in a pound of sugar at 5 cents a pound, butter would sell over the counter at 10.95 cents per pound instead of 35 cents per pound; bacon would sell at 8.45 cents per pound instead of 29 cents per pound; lamb would sell at 3.95 cents per pound instead of 47 cents per pound; and milk at 2.04 cents per quart instead of 13 cents per quart.

Therefore, Mr. President, I do not know that I can find myself subscribing to the view that the sugar industry in the United States is an expensive industry. Sugar is cheaper here than in practically every other country in the world. The tariff duties that we levy on it produce a tremendous revenue, equivalent to around one fourth of our total customs revenue. It is not only an industry that ought to be encouraged from the standpoint of encouraging the American farmer and the American factory but it is also a necessity.

Continental production of sugar is especially necessary to the United States in time of war. That thought was vividly brought home to us when we were engaged in the World War, and had to economize as much as possible in the use of sugar. That lesson was brought to Great Britain during the World War. At that time she was producing no sugar; but with her far-seeing vision she has proceeded to encourage, not to discourage, that industry. She proceeded to establish it in the British Isles and in Ireland. Starting during the World War without any production at all, she is now producing something like half a million short tons of raw sugar a year.

There is, therefore, according to my way of thinking, every reason why this industry ought to be encouraged in the United States; every reason why the production, manufacturing and refining of sugar in continental United States ought to be encouraged. I repeat the position I took a while ago: If there comes an irreconcilable conflict between the production and manufacture of sugar in the continental United States and in other areas, I purpose to take my stand with the encouragement and the promotion of that industry in the mainland of this country. As I stated at the outset, with the adoption of the amendment I propose, and with the understanding I entertain in respect to when this bill will go into effect, as stated to me by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. COSTIGAN], who has the bill in charge—that it will go into effect in respect to quotas for the year 1934 on January 1, 1934—I expect to support the bill. It is not the best possible bill. It does not entirely conform to my views of what ought to be done, but it is the best we can do now. I

hope that in the years to come, basing our future views upon the experience in the administration of this measure, we shall be able to perfect it and perfect its administration in the United States, and that ultimately this legislative step which I feel sanguine we are about to take, will result in an encouragement of one of the great agricultural industries of this country, and in a permanent stabilization of it as the years roll on.

## EXHIBIT A

AMERICAN SUGARCANE LEAGUE,  
New Orleans, La., April 10, 1934.

HON. HENRY A. WALLACE,  
United States Department of Agriculture,  
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: It seems proper at this time for me to state to you that a thorough canvass just completed by this organization shows a production of 214,455 short tons of sugar (raw value) in Louisiana during the last campaign.

Mr. L. L. Janes, of the Bureau of Crop and Livestock Estimates here, has not yet issued his final report on the production of sugar in Louisiana during the last campaign but did issue a preliminary report or forecast December 27, 1933, before the campaign was over, in which he estimated the production at 202,000 short tons of sugar. This figure has been generally used since then as the most authoritative one available, but Mr. Janes does not, in his reports on Louisiana sugar production, reduce his figures to raw value, and his prediction of 202,000 short tons is thus misleading if considered without due analysis.

The actual production of sugar in Louisiana last campaign, according to reports received by us from each factory was as follows:

	Short tons
Raws .....	136,074
Crystals .....	<sup>1</sup> 13,547
Turbinados .....	<sup>2</sup> 6,088
Washed raws .....	<sup>1</sup> 1,500
Granulated .....	<sup>1</sup> 51,527
String sugars .....	<sup>1</sup> 5,719
Total .....	<sup>2</sup> 214,455

In reducing the different grades of sugar mentioned above to raw value we used the polarizations given on the returns made to us, or, where none were given, we assumed that crystals polarized 98.5, washed raws 98, seconds and thirds 92 and 90, respectively, and we used 107 pounds of raws as being the equivalent of 100 pounds of granulated. To this may be added the sugar in our sirup and edible molasses equivalent to 31,214 short tons, 96° raw value.

In determining the total sugar content of sirup and edible molasses we assumed an average density of 39.5 Baumé for sirup with 65.6 percent total sugars. For first molasses we assumed 42 Baumé with 68.3 percent total sugars, and for second molasses 42.5 Baumé with 60.5 percent total sugars.

The only other product is blackstrap. We have not attempted to reduce that to a total sugar basis. The number of gallons of blackstrap produced, according to our careful and complete canvass, was 10,832,639.

Yours truly,

REGINALD DYKERS,  
Vice President and General Manager.

## PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of New York, memorializing Congress to amend the Securities Act of 1933 by eliminating all of its civil liability provisions, to the end that business, by being permitted to finance itself, may thereby be in a position to finance employment when the ability of the Government so to do is exhausted, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See resolution printed in full when presented today by Mr. COPELAND.)

Mr. WALSH presented a statement prepared by Hon. L. L. McCANDLESS, Delegate from Hawaii, averring that "the Territory of Hawaii should in all fairness be given equal treatment in the fixing of a quota in the Costigan-Jones sugar bill as that accorded mainland producers", which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a letter signed by the recording secretary of Branch 18, National Association of Letter Carriers, of New Bedford, Mass., stating, "The officers and members of Branch 18, National Association of Letter Carriers, wish to extend to you their appreciation and thanks for your support given them in the independent offices bill pertain-

ing to Federal employees", which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented resolutions adopted by the Holyoke Central Labor Union, of Holyoke, and Local Union No. 145, United Association of Journeyman Plumbers and Steam Fitters, of Medford, in the State of Massachusetts, favoring the passage of the so-called "Wagner-Lewis bill", pertaining to unemployment insurance, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. COPELAND presented the following concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of New York, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

STATE OF NEW YORK,  
IN SENATE,  
Albany, April 11, 1934.

By Mr. H. L. O'Brien

Whereas it is the judgment of eminent economists and practical business executives that business recovery is retarded by the inability of manufacturing and commercial establishments throughout the country to obtain operating capital, thereby unnecessarily continuing and aggravating the deplorable unemployment situation which has brought so much suffering and deprivation to millions of workers and their families; and

Whereas it is generally conceded that manufacturing and commercial executives have, in the main, cooperated sincerely with the National Government in the effort to relieve suffering and bring business back to a stable and economically sound normalcy; and

Whereas it is now generally conceded that the operation of the Federal Securities Act of 1933 has interfered with the orderly recovery of business: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved (if the assembly concur)*, That the Congress of the United States be and the same hereby is respectfully memorialized to amend the Securities Act of 1933 by eliminating all of its civil liability provisions to the end that business, by being permitted to finance itself, may thereby be in a position to finance employment when the ability of the Government so to do is exhausted; and be it further

*Resolved (if the assembly concur)*, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the Clerk of the House of Representatives, the Secretary of the United States Senate, and to each Member of Congress elected from the State of New York.

By order of the senate.

MARGUERITE O'CONNELL, Clerk.

In assembly April 12, 1934.

Concurred in without amendment.

By order of the assembly.

FRED W. HAMMOND, Clerk.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. MCGILL, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill (S. 493) to protect labor in its old age, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 744) thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (S. 3044) granting a pension to Eleanor Emma Bliss, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 739) thereon.

Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to which was referred the bill (H.R. 8889) to provide for the custody and maintenance of the United States Supreme Court Building and the equipment and grounds thereof, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 745) thereon.

Mr. BYRNES, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to which was referred the resolution (S.Res. 208) increasing the limit of expenditures for the investigation of the business of banking and dealings in securities, reported it without amendment.

## BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. CAPPER:

A bill (S. 3403) for the relief of Lyda F. Foster; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. KING:

A bill (S. 3404) authorizing loans from the Federal Emergency Administration of Public Works for the construction of certain municipal buildings in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

<sup>1</sup> 96° raw value.

<sup>2</sup> Not including sugar in sirup and molasses.

By Mr. DILL:

A bill (S. 3405) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. HAYDEN:

A bill (S. 3406) providing for a reimbursable loan to the Indians of the Navajo Reservation in the States of Arizona, New Mexico, and Utah; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. McKELLAR:

A bill (S. 3407) authorizing the establishment and maintenance of an industrial plant at Reedsville, W.Va.; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. COPELAND:

A bill (S. 3408) to provide for a preliminary examination of Cromline Creek in the State of New York, with a view to the control of its floods; to the Committee on Commerce.

INCLUSION OF SUGAR BEETS AND CANE AS BASIC COMMODITIES—  
AMENDMENT

Mr. COPELAND submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H.R. 8861) to include sugar beets and sugar cane as basic agricultural commodities under the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMATEUR BOXING IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—CONFERENCE  
REPORT

Mr. KING submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 828) to authorize boxing in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the text of the bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

On page 3, line 7, of the House engrossed amendments, strike out the word "amateur"; and the House agree to the same.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the title of the bill; and agree to the same.

WILLIAM H. KING,  
ARTHUR CAPPER,  
ROYAL S. COPELAND,  
*Managers on the part of the Senate.*  
MARY T. NORTON,  
VINCENT L. PALMISANO,  
JAS. L. WHITLEY,  
*Managers on the part of the House.*

The report was agreed to.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

ECONOMY AND TAXATION—ADDRESS BY SENATOR METCALF

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask permission to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. METCALF] over a national radio network last Friday night on the subject of Economy and Taxation.

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

ECONOMY AND TAXATION

Two things are certain for all men. They are death and taxes. The problem of revenue for the business of government is as old as organized society. The United States was founded with a simple system of direct taxes. During the short period of our existence we have built up a veritable spider web of taxation. We start paying taxes as soon as we get up in the morning and we continue to pay all day, until at night we switch off the tax on electricity and go into a troubled sleep. As yet no man has devised a manner to place a tax on that. Since the beginning of the Nation taxes have each year been eating away more and more of our national income. The percentage of our income which has been expended for the business of government has increased

as the Nation progressed. During the past few years the momentum of this increase has gained by leaps and bounds. In 1913 the total cost of all forms of government in the United States was approximately \$3,000,000,000, but in this year it will approach \$18,000,000,000. In other words, in the last 20 years the proportion of the earnings of the American people which have been used by various branches of the Government has mounted from 9 percent to something like 40 percent. Who would have thought 5 years ago there would be lobbyists in Washington trying to get legislation through that would permit our cities and towns to go bankrupt?

The average American citizen fails to realize that he is paying more than one third of all he earns to the Government in one form or the other. The true facts are hidden by the intricate system of taxation peculiar to the United States. But actually every dollar we expend bears its toll of excise, income, corporation, property, and processing taxes. The cost of an article cannot be broken down into materials, labor, profit, and taxes, but if this could be accurately accomplished we would find that by far the greater part of our dollar is used for the business of government. By the business of government, of course, I include such very necessary functions as the operation of our schools, our police and our fire departments.

Taxation is power. Not only have the costs of government ascended with startling rapidity but there has been a pronounced movement of power concentration toward a central government. Authority has moved with systematic progression from the old-fashioned town meeting to the States, eventually to the Federal Government, and now to the President of the United States. In other words, we are drifting from pure democracy to dictatorship. Events of the past year have more than emphasized this fact. The tremendous acceleration toward the investment of a central authority with the powers of taxation and regulation of society is something we would not have believed could exist 5 years ago.

The time has been particularly ripe for a movement of this nature. The country has been in the throes of a depression and the people have turned in desperation to any new school of thought or any new and drastic proposal which might be made as a panacea for our economic ills. The trend toward abdication of the democracy in favor of a dictatorship is exemplified by transfer to the Executive in two distinct ways. The first is the power to tax. The second is the power to control. The tariff bill now pending in this Congress gives the President the power to enter into trade agreements with foreign nations. He will be clothed with the authority to enforce and encourage the objections of these agreements through the taxing power and through power to remove trade restrictions and import barriers. He will be able to reduce or increase tariffs by 50 percent. He will be authorized to remove all restrictions on importations from abroad. He can remove excise taxes and processing taxes which have been imposed for the purpose of regulating importations. The purpose of this bill is to encourage the importation into the United States of some commodities in order that we might sell others abroad. The Secretary of Agriculture has already publicly stated that the manufacture of finer textiles in the United States is slated for destruction should this bill become law. He states that the manufacture of lace, for example, is a business which is inefficient in this country and, consequently, we should permit the Chinese and French to furnish us with laces. The President can reduce tariffs on these commodities by 50 percent, as well as wipe off the books all import restrictions in regard to them.

Thus, he will have the power to put 20,000 workers in the lace and embroidery plants of the United States out of work. In many cases these are people who know how to do nothing else. Where will they turn for jobs? The millions of dollars which people have invested in machinery and equipment for manufacturing enterprises will be sacrificed on the altar of foreign trade. To invest any one man with such tremendous powers is most unwise. It is most certainly un-American. Constitutional principles have been ignored in the drafting of such legislation. Who can tell what industries, built up after years of painstaking effort, will be closed by these dangerous experiments. Thus, the tariff bill alone gives to the Executive the power to tax, the power to remove taxes, and the power to regulate industry as great as any dictator on the face of the earth. The Government is now going into industrial competition with industries which it may tax out of business. The whole country must pay taxes for unwise public management.

I have already mentioned that the second indication of the establishment of the centralization of power is the concentration of the authority to impose taxes. The President today, through the Secretary of Agriculture, is clothed with the authority to impose processing taxes upon basic commodities produced in the United States. To carry it still further, he is given the power to tax any competing product.

Throughout this session of Congress we have been engaged in the business of appropriating money. Billions of dollars are being squandered in excess of the actual income of the Government. Prosperity cannot be brought about by taxation. It cannot be brought about by throwing the Nation deeper and deeper into debt. We are creating an artificial situation where the Government is mortgaging its very existence in an endeavor to pour billions of dollars into a temporary business stimulation. We heard much in the last campaign about economy. Today that much publicized economy program is camouflaged by twin budgets. We are told in Washington that we have one budget for emergency purposes and another for the normal business of

government. On the one hand, the normal budget is supposed to be reduced in the name of economy, while, on the other, we have a budget for emergency purposes which is so fat it staggers, but we hide the sins of the one behind the skirts of the other. I believe there is not a person in Washington who has the slightest idea what the normal expenses of government are at this time. There is so much juggling of accounts, so much blaming of one budget for the sins of the other, so much pretense of economy on the one hand and wasteful spending on the other, that it leaves us quite bewildered.

Sometime ago the annual appropriation to take care of veterans wounded or disabled during the World War was considered by the Congress. The President vetoed the act of Congress on the ground that it was a wasteful expenditure of money and not in line with his economy program. Much was said about an increase of over \$200,000,000 in the normal budget. When the Congress passed this bill over the Executive veto, and when the complete story was told, it was found that the appropriations for veterans were actually only \$20,000,000 in excess of what the Administration had agreed was just. Furthermore, to make the situation a little more ironical, Senator VANDENBERG of Michigan read into the RECORD a quotation from remarks of the Speaker of the House of Representatives as he left the White House on Friday, March 30. Speaker RAINY is quoted as saying: "The President intended to do by Executive order exactly what the bill proposes by the end of the year. Under the President's plan almost all veterans cut off the rolls by the economy bill would have been restored." If that is true the only damage done by the passage of the bill over the President's veto was that it deprived the Administration of some political prestige.

A shining example of this 2-budget system of camouflage is the Bureau of Ordnance, in the War Department. The appropriation for this Bureau was reduced by some three million dollars by the Administration in carrying out its economy program. However, the other hand reached into the pocket of the Budget's twin sister, the emergency budget, took out \$6,000,000 in Public Works funds, and gave it to the Bureau of Ordnance. This money is to be used for the purchase of ammunition. In any ordinary year ammunition is charged as a part of the ordinary expenses of government. There has been some four hundred and eighty-seven million dollars of emergency funds which are charged to the so-called "emergency budget" being expended on Federal projects. The Department of Agriculture no longer carries the tremendous appropriations for public roads on its ordinary budget. In all past years this has been a part of the expenditures of that Department. Thus the economy program has affected the Department of Agriculture by giving it \$400,000,000 from the Public Works funds. In past years appropriations for the Bureau of Yards and Docks have been carried as a part of the ordinary expenses of government. This year these funds are being supplied from the emergency budget. The same situation is true throughout the myriad of Government bureaus, commissions, and departments. Money is being taken from the emergency budget, placed in the normal Budget, expended from the latter, and then paraded before the country as economy. Actually, there is no such thing as an economy program in the country today.

Of course, as good Americans we must care for the hungry, and the sick, and the cold. We cannot and must not allow our fellow citizens to suffer for the ordinary necessities of life. If there is no work for them, we must give them relief, but at least let us do it without subterfuge and with the utmost wisdom in the use of our national resources. Economy seems to be a lost word. It is a word that has come to mean a complicated system of accountability rather than judicious spending. We should know where we are heading before it is too late.

The national debt is being increased to \$32,000,000,000. Some day this must be paid.

Powers are being bestowed on the Executive that point toward dictatorship. This is unwise and dangerous. The courage and the ability of the President of the United States is unquestioned, but no man and no system is infallible. We should let him know our wishes and assist him toward their realization, but constructive criticism and orderly and sound thought are essential in times like these. We are heading into new and strange fields. We should move with utmost caution and guard against top-heavy taxation or entering into social experiments from which we will not easily recover.

#### FARM REFINANCING BILL—STATEMENT BY KNUD WEFALD

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement by former Representative Wefald, railroad and warehouse commissioner of Minnesota, on the farm refinancing measure which is pending before the Agricultural Committees of the Senate and the House.

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

CONGRESS SHOULD PASS THE FRAZIER-LEMKE BILL FOR FARM REFINANCING. THE FARMERS NEED IT AND DEMAND IT

The Frazier-Lemke Farm Refinancing bill is yet undisposed of in Congress, even though the State Legislatures of Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, and Wisconsin have petitioned Congress to enact this measure into law.

The newspapers tell us that in the House, a petition for the withdrawal of this bill from the committee, which has it in charge, now upon the Clerk's desk, had already received 130 signatures and enough signatures were in sight to withdraw the bill from the committee, when Democratic leaders began to exert pressure against the signing of the withdrawal petition.

It is hard for people out in the farm country to understand such procedure. The States which have petitioned Congress for the passage of this bill have a representation of 165 in the House, but as I understand it, only 86 of these 165 have signed the withdrawal petition. We, out in the Farm country cannot understand why Representatives in Congress should not heed the petitions from their own legislature back home. We know who have signed the petition. The farmers' organizations are much more clever now in keeping their own people informed about what is going on in Congress than they were in the days of the agitation for the McNary-Haugen bill.

We cannot understand why, out of 20 Representatives from California, only 7 have signed the withdrawal petition; nor how, out of 25 from Illinois, only 9 have done so; or why, out of 12 from Indiana, only 3 have responded. Indiana farmers surely need a lift if any farmers in the country need it.

But it surely pleases us to see that 12 good men from Pennsylvania have signed the petition, leading the list of signatures from any State in number. There was a time when people in the farm country could not visualize Pennsylvania Congressmen as anything but pawns in the hands of industrial barons seeking selfish tariff protection. Of late I have heard farmers say, "Let us move to Pennsylvania, for they will have a good government there soon."

We are pleased to see Ohio have six Representatives join hands with us. And Vermont, Calvin Coolidge's good old granite State, joining in the petition 100 percent. How happy "Cal" would have been to know that! The world surely does move.

Now, even if the Frazier-Lemke bill cannot become a law in this session of Congress, if the committee will not act on it, we in the farm country are entitled to have it discussed. If Congress can show us that we are crazy, we shall be glad to have it shown, for all of us—farmers, business men, workers and all, except a few plutes (of which there are not many left) are for the Frazier-Lemke bill. If we are crazy, there are a lot of crazy people in the United States just now. Congressmen and Senators should know this for their own protection. Just a whispered suspicion in some of the farm States to the effect that a Senator or Representative, no matter how fine his record otherwise, has been hostile or lukewarm toward the Frazier-Lemke bill, might endanger him for reelection this year.

We had expected this bill to be enacted into law before now. We were told in the campaign of 1932 that Mr. Roosevelt would sign such a law if passed by Congress. Also that he would aid its passage through Congress. We had the strongest guaranty as to this from men who were authorized to dicker for farm votes. Nothing but the Frazier-Lemke bill gave Minnesota to Roosevelt, and the same situation existed in other States.

I spoke for Mr. Roosevelt on the strength of the promise we received, from the time I started my campaign in 1932 until the very close. Not in a single talk did I forget him, although I was running for State office. I reached more people in that campaign than any Democratic speaker or candidate in our State. I feel partly responsible for the vote Minnesota gave Mr. Roosevelt and I hope that some of the good friends I had during my service in Congress, especially among the Democrats, will consider us farm folks entitled to some consideration in our hour of need.

What farm refinancing Congress has put over will not solve the farm crisis. The only salvation for the farmers, economically speaking, is in legislation like that suggested in the Frazier-Lemke bill. I talked the idea embodied in this bill when I fought valiantly for reelection to Congress in 1926. I was told that I was crazy then, but the farm country thinks differently now.

The main thought in this bill is to safeguard the farmer in the possession of his farm by lifting off from his back a part of his debt load, and extending to him a rate of interest under which he can meet his payments. If this is done, the farmer will take care of himself; Congress then will not need to pass much additional legislation for the farmers. If the farmers were now given their choice between the passage of this bill, on one hand, with no other extra legislation as against on the other hand, all the farm legislation introduced in Congress, with much more that can be thought up by the "brain trust", they would not hesitate in choosing the Frazier-Lemke bill.

Let the farmer know that he can sit securely on his farm and he will live through any emergency and deflation that will strike the country.

The spirit of the pioneers can be easily resurrected on the farms, and out of such an awakening will spring the noblest life yet lived in America. The real farmers do not want to be regimented as soldiers under any "brain-trust" plan; they do not want to be socialized; the bulk of them are of northern European stock, rooted in democracy, inured to hardship, frugal, and God-fearing, who want to live in individual homes, and in the family circle work out the plans for their own welfare.

Only the farmers themselves can solve the question of overproduction. It is the farmers who are hopelessly in debt who produce the surplus farm products. Lift the debt loads off from all of them, and they will take a jubilee year to celebrate their redemption from threatened slavery.

No governmental regulation can bring about crop reduction. Farm leaders tell me that farmers are asked to reduce their corn,

acreage 20 percent, but Secretary of Agriculture Wallace's seed firm urges the farmers to buy their improved corn, which will yield 23 percent more than what they have been planting before. So there will be at least as much corn, if all follow this advice, as if no acreage reduction is made, if a normal year.

If you give us the Frazier-Lemke bill, the farmers say, you can discharge the "brain trust" from thinking for the farmers and you can close up the Department of Agriculture for many years.

This bill applies the same principle to the refinancing of the farm debt that we applied to the allied war debt when that was funded. The principle applied was "the ability to pay." Only the farmers do not ask Congress to do anywhere near as much for them as it did for the European war governments. Our own farmers' welfare should be of much more concern to us than anything in Europe.

The rehabilitation of our farmers will mean the rehabilitation of industry. Nothing else will save industry.

The Frazier-Lemke bill demands that the Federal Government shall refinance the farm debt on the basis of present-day values of the farms at a rate of interest of 1½ percent and 1½-percent amortization payment by the issuance of Treasury notes against the first mortgage on the farms. That is the bill in a nutshell.

Every Member of Congress must be familiar with the terms of this bill now. No man has in recent years done such a noble work, that I know of, as has Mr. LEMKE in carrying the gospel of this salvation of the farmers into so many States of the Union as he has visited. As Peter the Hermit summoned the Crusaders to the rescue of the Holy City out of the hands of the heathens, he has summoned the farm States to the defense of themselves against Wall Street; and he will not die, I hope, until he wrests Wall Street's strangle hold from the throat of the farmers.

The bidding of Wall Street is blocking the passage of this bill. If this bill passes, the farm debt can be amortized over a period of 47 years. Over that period it will, so Mr. LEMKE says, "reduce the farmer's indebtedness by three fifths because of the lower rate of interest." The Government will make a net profit on the farm loans over this period of time of \$6,345,000,000.

If farm interest is kept up as now, Wall Street will over this period rake in at least \$20,000,000,000 in farm-loan interest. Under the plan of this bill, farm-loan creditors will stand the best chance of being paid back the greatest share of the money loaned; for under this plan the farmer can carry three times the load under the lower interest. But, best of all, his debt fixed in the proper relation to the value of his farm, the farmer, under the lower interest rate, would have three times the money to spend in the channels of trade out of the money he now pays out for interest.

For example: On a \$10,000 loan, amortized over a period of 47 years the farmer will save \$24,000 in interest, while the Government will make a profit of \$1,100 on it.

We can easily visualize what the interest saving will mean to a country town surrounded by a hundred such farms, and what it again will mean to trade and industry. Of all so-called "money inflation plans", if you choose to call this bill such, it is the safest of them all, as it makes the good and fertile soil of our country a money basis. It will also be the only money issued on which the Government earns interest.

Under this plan farm values will also become better stabilized than under any other farm-loan system. Stabilization of farm values will help stabilize all other property values. When farm values fall over the whole country, even the value of New York skyscrapers is affected. Farm values, due to the greed of the money trust, fell first, but they in the end brought all other values down with them.

The two greatest economic factors in organized society are men and land. Men without land are helpless, and land without free men upon it is of no value.

Out of the land (soil) comes all wealth in the first place, and the men upon the soil must be treated rightly or society will suffer. Land values must not be a gambling asset to be run up and down, for with the fluctuations of such values, the men of the soil suffer. The passage of the Frazier-Lemke bill will stabilize land values. It is also the only remedy for the farm ills proposed, which will not have a tendency to increase the cost of food, for the difference in the farmers' interest outlay will be profit that will help to bring about cost of production on a reasonable level of price of farm products.

Let us have this bill enacted into law now. If the House disposes of this bill as a still-born child, its ghost will haunt many a good Congressman in the next campaign.

THE GREAT ILLUSION—EDITORIAL FROM SATURDAY EVENING POST

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial appearing in the Saturday Evening Post under date of April 7, 1934, entitled "The Great Illusion."

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

[From the Saturday Evening Post, Philadelphia, Apr. 7, 1934]

THE GREAT ILLUSION

The Saturday Evening Post is neither a Republican nor a Democratic organ. It does not condone the abuses of power and trust of the Republican Party while it was in office, and it cannot endorse those policies and experiments of the new deal that look to the left. In our opinion, this is a time when the press and the

public must examine thoroughly and feel free to criticize every proposal advanced by the administration. We can imagine no greater disservice to the country than the hush-hush policy advocated by so many adherents of the new deal. It is better to be careful now than sorry later. It is safer to put over one sound plan than a dozen doubtful experiments. Recovery is important, but the fundamental issue today is the preservation of democracy and our traditional American liberties along with recovery.

It is hard to believe that when the Republicans were in office they were 100 percent crooked. It is equally hard to believe that the Democrats are 100 percent pure, now that they have taken over the Government, for there is more than a suspicion that there are seekers after special privilege in their ranks of the same stripe as those who were inside the breastworks or were camp followers of the Republican Party. In appraising both parties, it is well to remember that under Republican rule the promises and covenants of the Government were kept. On the other hand, the recent devaluation and financial programs that involved the repudiation of our solemn covenants are a blot on the 'scutcheon of the Democratic Party which no emergency soft soap will wash out. Furthermore, we are now being told that some of these "emergency" measures, which were cheerfully accepted by the public for the duration of the emergency, are to be made permanent.

The question before the American people—a question that is inextricably interwoven with the policies and experiments of the moment—is this: Do we want a democratic or a collectivist system? Do we want freedom as individuals to live our lives under the Constitution and free courts? do we want individual opportunity and scope to work out our private and business lives within sane and law-abiding limits or do we want to be regimented—told what we can do, how much we can do and when we can do it? do we want a free press, a free radio, and free speech, or someone to tell us what we can think and what we can say? Secretary Wallace, in denying that we are tainted with either fascism or communism, says that we are living in a state of illusion. We agree, but we would make it plural. Among many others, our illusions are that nature is not the dominant partner in all farm operations, and that theories which clash with realities are workable.

If we do not want to swing far over to the left, a strong and intelligent opposition party must take the field. As it is today, both the Republican and Democratic Parties embrace conservatives, liberals, socialists, and opportunists. The so-called "Progressives" have for years been playing both ends against the middle and are today, in everything except the label that they cling to for purely political reasons, frankly Democrats. The Republican Party has lacked the courage to make them move over into the new deal bed and lie there. But unless the Republican Party cleans house, adopts a liberal platform, while holding fast to American constitutional ideals and principles, we can see small chance for it.

Today there is no clear line of cleavage in the membership of the two parties. The Democratic Party has cut loose from its traditions and stands for a strongly centralized, bureaucratic Government that is getting a grip on every kind of private business and putting into effect many extremely radical measures that look toward ultimate collectivism. Some of those who loosely call themselves Republicans belong in the Democratic Party. An even larger number of those labeled Democrats, who still hold to traditional American ideals and institutions, belong in a reformed and reconstructed Republican Party.

Meanwhile the country moves farther and farther towards the left, for the implication, if not the intention, of proposal after proposal that is put forth by the party in power takes us closer and closer to collectivism, makes it harder and harder to retreat to Americanism, and predicates, logically and inexorably, something very close to the Russian system.

Right now there is a "What the hell!" attitude in the air. A large part of the public is saying, "We can't be any worse off than we were, so we'll take a chance on this one." That is the new philosophy that goes with the new deal.

But we could be a good deal worse off than we were and are. Every failure of an ill-conceived and hastily tried measure is a step backward in the healing process that natural causes have been bringing about both here and abroad. We believe that there is enough of the old spirit left among the more fortunate in America to sacrifice for the unfortunate and to submit to the last limit of taxation to help through the depression, so long as the money is usefully employed, and expended without politics, graft, and waste, and so long as their traditional and constitutional liberties are maintained. That would be a hard pull temporarily, but it would have a sound finish.

Some of the plans that have no final left-wing connotation and that are being hastily thrown into the new deal hopper contain the elements of success. With careful planning and wise administration over a term of months and years they would unquestionably prove helpful. But with the administration springing a new panacea every morning on a bewildered public and demanding the passing without delay of a pre-prepared bill by a yes-sir Congress, there is small chance for even a good idea to work out. In the case of almost every major plan that has been advanced, it has been found that certain provisions are in opposition to other provisions and that in practical operation they tend to cancel one another and to negative the good features of the measure.

We can think of no plan or measure that has been put out by the administration that does not call for long and careful consideration by business experts familiar with the strains and

stresses that even the best-conceived plan must meet in practical operation. For, despite the contrary idea that is being advanced in many quarters, there are plenty of honest and patriotic business men in the country. But most of the legislation that is being proposed bears the imprint of the "brain trust"—so-called "intellectuals" who have theories about what makes the wheels go around and what ought to make them go around, but who have never made a wheel turn over.

C.W.A. is a good example of this. Carefully planned and slowly put into effect with able administrators, with politics and politicians ruthlessly eliminated, with nothing but useful and necessary work undertaken, and with wages paid on a scale that would not disorganize local business and tempt labor already employed into its ranks, it would have proved a useful stop-gap.

N.R.A. has many admirable features, but from the first it has been in danger of falling into the hands of extremists and has undoubtedly worked hardships that were probably unforeseen when it was put out in its half-baked condition. Because it has not come up to expectations, new ideas and new plans are being considered that will further endanger its success. Instead of labor and capital working together, there is a drift toward impossible conditions for capital. We have no sympathy with hard-boiled employers, and we have none with just as hard-boiled labor leaders. We are unalterably opposed to sweated labor, and we believe in the payment by every industry of the highest wages that it can stand, with due consideration of the rights of all the interests involved. But we can see no real gain in making it impossible for industry to make profits and to pay dividends. Many concerns are paying good wages, others in the same industry not so good. If we were to treat them all alike, with a blanket 10 percent increase in wages and a 10 percent or more decrease in hours, a large number of businesses that are already in the red and that have been living on hope and steadily decreasing reserves would go to the wall, and many others would have to discontinue the payment of dividends. In short, anything of the sort would be a long step toward abolishing the profit motive, so ardently advocated in some quarters. Though N.R.A. has disclaimed any intention of enforcing blanket decreases and increases, business rightly awaits the event with apprehension. A wise doctor will not advise a patient who is slowly recovering from a long illness and beginning to sit up, to take dumbbell exercises before breakfast.

If conditions are made impossible for the employer, and Government finally has to take over, as many of our left-wingers hope, labor will find that, in the end, it has the hardest taskmaster and the lowest scale of living in its history. The proof is in many countries today. In giving a 40-hour week to labor and the increases in pay already made, always excepting the so-called "chiselers", industry has gone about as far as it can safely go under present conditions.

If the present drift continues, the farmer, too, is in for a rude awakening from his illusions. Already, it is apparent that A.A.A. is not working out on schedule, and ambitious plans to move a large population off marginal lands are in the making and cotton planters are in for real regimentation. It is, of course, only a step from this to telling producers of wheat, cattle, hogs, dairy, and other farm products what and how much they can raise, where they can live, and whether they can farm at all. Finally, such a program would lead to the dispossession of the kulaks—that is, the owners of good farms on which they can make a profit above their living expenses—and the collectivization of their land by the Government.

Many of those who are drifting with the tide will say that anything of this sort is impossible, but they do not know some of their professors. Much of it is already under way or planned, and the rest is a perfectly logical conclusion from the premises. During the past year we have taken first steps toward this goal that are longer than those that remain to be taken. The country is headed to the left and is already deep in left territory.

Hand in hand with our experiments, a series of investigations and exposures have been taking place, and though they have been aimed almost solely at Republicans in the previous administration, we are for them. Expose the offenders and turn them out if they deserve it. Later, perhaps, Congress may get around to an investigation of some of the Democrats. That there are offenders in that party, too, is possible—in fact, the President himself has turned up several leads. However, it was not necessary to disorganize the Air Mail Service in order to punish individuals who may have been guilty of improper practices. There are orderly and legal ways to punish the guilty without depriving the innocent of their livelihood and hamstringing the finest commercial air service in the world.

No other publication in the United States has more consistently opposed the indiscriminate sale of foreign bonds in the United States and preached as strongly, year in and year out, against the evils of speculation than has the Saturday Evening Post. We have refused to take financial advertising, even from houses that we knew were reputable and honest in their dealings, because it was impossible for us thoroughly to investigate securities and to guarantee our readers against loss in those stocks and bonds that bankers and brokers sought to advertise in our columns. But we do not believe that it is necessary to hamstring or kill our exchanges—for they perform many useful and necessary functions and services—in order to stop the manipulation of securities and the rooking of the investing public. There is a great difference between cleaning up and killing, between getting the crooks and

crippling the bankers and brokers who perform services that are vital to the business of the Nation.

When one looks over all these measures, when one considers their kill-to-cure provisions, one can only conclude that they have been planned and drawn by men untainted with any practical experience. There is something almost sophomoric about the ideas and plans of these smart, shallow young men who are so cocksure and so determined to make us all over in 5 or 10 minutes.

It is impossible to escape the conclusion that today we are having government by amateurs—college boys, irrespective of their age—who, having drunk deep, perhaps, of the Pierian spring, have recently taken some hearty swigs of Russian vodka. We cannot solve our problems with a discredited European ideology and a Marxian philosophy.

The great illusion of the moment is that we can gain any worth-while happiness or prosperity by the sacrifice of our hardy won liberties.

#### AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ADMINISTRATION

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. President, on the 4th of April I made a statement with reference to the cost of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration. That statement covered the returns of the processing tax, and, in addition thereto, the possible overdraft or deficit between now and the end of the fiscal year 1934.

The activities of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration are reflected in the Government reports. There should be no room for dispute when all of the items are taken into account.

Secretary Wallace, in his press release of April 4, 1934, said that he had checked over the receipts and disbursements with reference to the processing tax and the expenditures of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration and found that there had been collected \$9,000,000 more than the expenditures. He further expressed regret that the expenditures had not been greater than the collections.

Secretary Wallace quoted from the Treasury statement of March 30, and showed the expenditures as of that date at \$228,927,000. This item is found in the general expenditures as recorded on page 2 of the Treasury statement. The Secretary failed to take into account the emergency expenditures found on the same page, amounting to \$60,762,000. He further failed to take into account the fact that in the general expenditures a reference is made to note 1 of page 3, which says that additional expenditures on these accounts for this month and the fiscal year 1934 are included under emergency expenditures, the classification of which will be shown on page 4 of the Treasury statement issued on the 15th day of each month.

The total expenditures, as shown by the March 15 statement, including advances to the Farm Credit Administration, Commodity Credit Corporation, and so forth, amount to \$78,315,096.55.

It is also found that in the law, under section 12 (a), a direct appropriation of \$100,000,000 is made available to the Secretary of Agriculture for administrative expenses, including rental and benefit payments under acreage control. This \$100,000,000 has been available since the passage of the act; but in addition thereto, under section 12 (b), we find that the Treasury is permitted to advance to the Secretary of Agriculture for said purposes, to wit, payment of rentals for acreage control, and other purposes, such amounts as the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Treasury shall jointly estimate from time to time are required.

Under the provisions of this section, the Treasury, prior to April 10, 1934, has already advanced to the Secretary of Agriculture \$455,885,000, which, in addition to the amount already appropriated of \$100,000,000, makes a total of \$555,885,000.

In other words, the statement given to the press by the Secretary of Agriculture that the processing tax was paying into the Treasury more than the total expense of the administration of the Agricultural Adjustment Act was clearly misleading.

In my statement I suggested that estimating the processing tax to the 30th of June 1934, according to the returns to date, it would be approximately \$348,091,274.79.

To anyone capable of understanding Government figures there can be no confusion between the 1934 Budget and the 1935 Budget. In the press release there was a suggestion made, as follows:

Secretary WALLACE. I think that was the estimate of the Budget for the whole year.

Question. And will carry into 1935?

Secretary WALLACE. I think that will carry into 1935.

In other words, it was insinuated that the figures given were for the fiscal year 1935.

The fiscal year of 1934 runs from July 1, 1933, to June 30, 1934. The fiscal year of 1935 runs from July 1, 1934, to June 30, 1935. There can be no possible confusion with reference to the limitations of these fiscal periods.

In the Department estimate for the fiscal year 1934, signed by Secretary Wallace, to the Budget Director, the estimated amount of money necessary to carry on under the Agricultural Adjustment Act is shown on page 189 of the Budget sent to Congress, and amounts to \$855,379,811. Included in this estimate, under nos. 2271 and 2272, are the following items for the following purposes.

In order that there may be no misunderstanding about this matter, I ask unanimous consent that the Budget sent to the Congress by the President covering the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, pages 187, 188, 189, and 190, be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COUZENS in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ADMINISTRATION

Salaries and expenses, Agricultural Adjustment Administration: [TITLE I, SEC. 12(a) There is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$100,000,000, to be available to the Secretary of Agriculture for administrative expenses under this title and for rental and benefit payments made with respect to reduction in acreage or reduction in production for market under part 2 of this title. Such sum shall remain available until expended.] (Public Act No. 10, 73d Cong., May 12, 1933, 48 Stat., p. 33.)

Annual appropriation, general fund.  
Appropriated 1934, \$100,000,000.

AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ADMINISTRATION—continued

By objects	Obligations				
	Estimate, 1935		Estimate, 1934		Actual, 1933
	Posi- tions	Av. salary	Posi- tions	Av. salary	Posi- tions
<b>PERSONAL SERVICE DEPARTMENTAL—continued</b>					
Clerical, administrative, and fiscal service—Continued.					
Grade 1. Junior typist.....	5	\$1,260	5	\$1,260	.....
Underclerk.....	3	1,260	3	1,260	.....
Underoperator.....	3	1,260	3	1,260	.....
Custodial service:					
Grade 2. Assistant messenger.....	7	1,080	7	1,080	0.1
Junior laborer.....	4	1,200	4	1,200	.....
Grade 1. Junior messenger.....	22	611	22	611	.....
Emergency service:					
Grade 19. Executive chief attorney.....	1	10,000	1	10,000	.....
Senior executive officer.....	6	9,767	6	9,767	.2
Grade 18. Chief economist.....	1	9,000	1	9,000	.....
Chief attorney.....	1	8,500	1	8,500	.....
Executive officer.....	4	8,250	4	8,250	.....
Grade 17. Head administrative officer.....	8	7,000	8	7,000	.4
Head attorney.....	10	6,883	10	6,883	.....
Head economist.....	1	6,800	1	6,800	.....
Grade 16. Head administrative officer.....	1	6,600	1	6,600	.....
Principal administrative officer.....	10	5,980	10	5,980	.3
Principal economist.....	4	6,000	4	6,000	.....
Principal attorney.....	8	5,875	8	5,875	.....
Grade 15. Senior economist.....	1	5,200	1	5,200	.....
Senior attorney.....	6	5,667	6	5,667	.....
Senior administrative officer.....	3	5,400	3	5,400	.....
Head accountant.....	1	5,600	1	5,600	.....
Grade 14. Senior economist.....	6	4,600	6	4,600	.....
Attorney.....	5	4,560	5	4,560	.....
Senior administrative officer.....	19	4,726	19	4,726	.3
Administrative officer.....	1	4,500	1	4,500	.....
Senior accountant.....	1	4,500	1	4,500	.....
Grade 13. Economist.....	9	4,167	9	4,167	.....
Attorney.....	3	4,267	3	4,267	.....
Administrative officer.....	13	4,231	13	4,231	.....
Grade 12. Associate economist.....	8	3,750	8	3,750	.....
Associate attorney.....	7	3,657	7	3,657	.....
Junior administrative officer.....	7	3,743	7	3,743	.4
Accountant.....	7	3,600	7	3,600	.....
Grade 11. Senior administrative assistant.....	3	3,433	3	3,433	.....
Associate economist.....	1	3,200	1	3,200	.....
Associate attorney.....	2	3,200	2	3,200	.1
Grade 10. Associate accountant.....	2	3,000	2	3,000	.....
Assistant attorney.....	1	3,000	1	3,000	.....
Assistant economist.....	2	2,950	2	2,950	.1
Administrative assistant.....	4	2,950	4	2,950	.....
Grade 9. Junior administrative assistant.....	10	2,640	10	2,640	.....
Assistant economist.....	2	2,600	2	2,600	.....
Assistant attorney.....	3	2,633	3	2,633	.....
Junior accountant.....	4	2,600	4	2,600	.....
Grade 8. Principal clerk.....	1	2,400	1	2,400	.....
Junior attorney.....	1	2,400	1	2,400	.....
Grade 7. Junior attorney.....	3	2,000	3	2,000	.....
Junior economist.....	1	2,200	1	2,200	.....
Grade 6. Clerk.....	1	1,800	1	1,800	.....
Grade 5. Senior stenographer.....	1	1,620	1	1,620	.....
Assistant clerk-stenographer.....	1	1,620	1	1,620	.....
Grade 4. Junior stenographer.....	1	1,440	1	1,440	.....
Total permanent, departmental.....	531	1,511,599	531	1,511,599	.....
Temporary employees, departmental.....		1,266,546		1,266,546	8.98
All personal services, departmental.....		2,778,145		2,778,145	8,989
<b>PERSONAL SERVICES, FIELD</b>					
Clerical, administrative, and fiscal service:					
Grade 2. Junior stenographer.....	4	1,440	4	1,440	.....
Emergency service:					
Grade 13. Administrative officer.....	1	4,000	1	4,000	.....
Grade 12. Accountant.....	1	3,600	1	3,600	.....
Grade 9. Junior administrative assistant.....	4	2,600	4	2,600	.....
Grade 6. Clerk.....	2	1,800	2	1,800	.....
Grade 5. Senior stenographer.....	2	1,620	2	1,620	.....
Grade 4. Senior typist.....	1	1,500	1	1,500	.....
Junior clerk.....	1	1,500	1	1,500	.....
Junior stenographer.....	5	1,440	5	1,440	.....
Grade 3. Assistant messenger.....	1	1,320	1	1,320	.....
Total permanent, field.....	22	42,120	22	42,120	.....
Temporary employees, field.....		1,240,000		1,010,170	.....
All personal services, field.....		1,282,120		52,290	.....
Total, departmental and field.....		4,060,265		2,830,435	8,989
Deduct legislative reductions.....				424,565	1,348
01 Personal services (net).....		4,060,265		2,405,870	7,641
<b>OTHER OBLIGATIONS</b>					
02 Supplies and materials.....		175,553		131,665	1,496
05 Communications.....		64,005		48,033	1
06 Travel expenses.....		564,500		314,800	1,955
07 Transportation of things.....		15,000		12,000	52
08 Printing and binding.....		130,900		194,800	.....
10 Furnishing heat, light, power, water, and electricity.....		3,300		3,300	.....

By objects	Obligations				
	Estimate, 1935		Estimate, 1934		Actual, 1933
	Posi- tions	Av. salary	Posi- tions	Av. salary	Posi- tions
<b>PERSONAL SERVICES, DEPARTMENTAL</b>					
Professional service:					
Grade 7. Head attorney.....	1	\$6,500	1	\$6,500	.....
Grade 6. Principal agricultural economist.....	3	5,600	3	5,600	.....
Grade 5. Senior agricultural economist.....					0.1
Grade 2. Assistant agricultural economist.....	1	2,600	1	2,600	.....
Grade 1. Junior agricultural economist.....	1	2,100	1	2,100	.....
Clerical, administrative, and fiscal service:					
Grade 14. Senior chief accountant.....	1	6,500	1	6,500	.....
Grade 13. Principal administrative officer.....	3	5,800	3	5,800	.....
Chief accountant.....	1	5,600	1	5,600	.....
Grade 12. Senior marketing specialist.....	2	4,800	2	4,800	.....
Senior administrative officer.....	4	4,600	4	4,600	.1
Head accountant.....	2	4,600	2	4,600	.....
Grade 11. Administrative officer.....	1	3,800	1	3,800	.....
Principal accountant.....	1	3,800	1	3,800	.....
Grade 9. Senior administrative assistant.....	3	3,200	3	3,200	1
Grade 8. Administrative assistant.....	1	2,900	1	2,900	.....
Grade 7. Junior administrative assistant.....	6	2,617	6	2,617	.....
Assistant marketing specialist.....	1	3,000	1	3,000	.....
Grade 6. Principal clerk.....	1	2,300	1	2,300	.....
Principal stenographer.....	1	2,300	1	2,300	.....
Grade 5. Head stenographer.....	4	2,000	4	2,000	.....
Senior clerk-stenographer.....	11	2,036	11	2,036	.....
Senior clerk.....	5	2,000	5	2,000	.....
Junior marketing specialist.....	1	2,000	1	2,000	.....
Grade 4. Principal stenographer.....	1	1,800	1	1,800	1
Clerk-stenographer.....	9	1,840	9	1,840	1
Bookkeeper.....	1	1,800	1	1,800	.....
Clerk.....	10	1,806	10	1,806	.....
Telegrapher.....	1	2,160	1	2,160	.....
Grade 3. Assistant clerk.....	21	1,687	21	1,687	.1
Assistant clerk-stenographer.....	24	1,658	24	1,658	.1
Senior stenographer.....	31	1,665	31	1,665	.3
Senior operator.....	1	1,620	1	1,620	.....
Grade 2. Junior stenographer.....	54	1,444	54	1,444	.1
Junior clerk-stenographer.....					.1
Junior clerk-typist.....	20	1,458	20	1,458	.2
Senior typist.....	34	1,447	34	1,447	.3
Junior clerk.....	27	1,476	27	1,476	.1
Junior operator.....	2	1,440	2	1,440	.....

AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ADMINISTRATION—continued

By objects	Obligations					
	Estimate, 1935		Estimate, 1934		Actual, 1933	
	Posi- tions	Av. salary	Posi- tions	Av. salary	Posi- tions	Av. salary
<b>OTHER OBLIGATIONS—continued</b>						
11 Rents.....		\$33,500		\$33,500		
12 Repairs and alterations.....		21,000		21,000		\$174
13 Special and miscellaneous current expenses.....		5,000		5,000		404
30 Equipment.....		50,000		78,232		5,651
Total other obligations.....		1,063,058		842,335		9,733
Add amounts transferred to Bureau of Labor Statistics, Department of Labor.....				+3,000		
Grand total obligations.....		5,123,323		3,251,205		17,374
1934 appropriation obligated in 1933.....				+17,374		
1934 appropriation obligated in 1935.....		-5,123,323		+5,123,323		
Unobligated balance, available for 1933.....				91,608,098		
Total estimate or appropriation.....				100,000,000		
<b>BY PROJECTS</b>						
1. General administration.....		624,802		624,802		17,374
2. Effectuating reduction in acreage or reduction in the production for market, or both.....		1,000,000		707,700		
3. Removal of agricultural surpluses.....		105,402		22,646		
4. Effecting marketing agreements, codes of fair competition, issuing licenses, and enforcing.....		3,291,641		1,791,579		
5. Protecting consumers' interests.....		101,478		104,478		
Total.....		5,123,323		3,251,205		17,374

PERMANENT INDEFINITE APPROPRIATION

Advances to Agricultural Adjustment Administration:  
 Sec. 12. (b) \* \* \* The Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Treasury shall jointly estimate from time to time the amounts, in addition to any money available under subsection (a), currently required for such purposes; and the Secretary of the Treasury shall, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, advance to the Secretary of Agriculture the amounts so estimated. The amount of any such advance shall be deducted from such tax proceeds as shall subsequently become available under this subsection (Agricultural Adjustment Act, Public, No. 10, 73d Cong., May 12, 1933, 48 Stat., p. 38).  
 Permanent appropriation, general fund:  
 Estimate 1935, \$831,022,428.  
 Appropriation 1934, 0.  
 Revised 1934, \$855,379,811.

AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ADMINISTRATION

By objects	Obligations					
	Estimate, 1935		Estimate, 1934		Actual, 1933	
	Posi- tions	Av. salary	Posi- tions	Av. salary	Posi- tions	Av. salary
<b>PERSONAL SERVICES, DEPARTMENTAL</b>						
Professional service:						
Grade 6. Principal agricultural economist.....	4	\$5,600	4	\$5,600		
Grade 5. Senior agricultural economist.....	2	4,600	2	4,600		
Grade 4. Agricultural economist.....	1	3,800	1	3,800		
Grade 3. Associate agricultural economist.....	1	3,200	1	3,200		
Grade 2. Assistant agricultural economist.....	1	2,600	1	2,600		
Grade 1. Junior agricultural economist.....	2	2,350	2	2,350		
Clerical, administrative, and fiscal service:						
Grade 13. Principal administrative officer.....	1	5,600	1	5,600		
Grade 12. Senior administrative officer.....	2	4,900	2	4,900		
Senior marketing specialist.....	3	4,667	3	4,667		
Head accountant.....	1	4,600	1	4,600		
Grade 11. Principal accountant.....	1	3,800	1	3,800		
Grade 10. Junior administrative officer.....	4	3,500	4	3,500		
Grade 9. Senior administrative assistant.....	1	3,200	1	3,200		
Grade 7. Junior administrative assistant.....	8	2,600	8	2,600		
Grade 5. Senior clerk.....	11	2,000	11	2,000		
Grade 4. Bookkeeper.....	1	1,800	1	1,800		
Clerk.....	12	1,800	12	1,800		
Stenographer.....	1	1,800	1	1,800		
Clerk-stenographer.....	3	1,900	3	1,900		
Head operator.....	1	1,800	1	1,800		
Grade 3. Assistant clerk.....	60	1,623	60	1,623		
Assistant clerk-stenographer.....	6	1,670	6	1,670		
Senior stenographer.....	1	1,620	1	1,620		
Grade 2. Junior clerk.....	32	1,440	32	1,440		
Junior stenographer.....	7	1,440	7	1,440		
Senior typist.....	1	1,440	1	1,440		
Junior operator.....	4	1,440	4	1,440		
Grade 1. Underclerk.....	16	1,260	16	1,260		
Underoperator.....	3	1,260	3	1,260		
Underclerk-typist.....	1	1,260	1	1,260		

AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ADMINISTRATION—continued

By objects	Obligations					
	Estimate, 1935		Estimate, 1934		Actual, 1933	
	Posi- tions	Av. salary	Posi- tions	Av. salary	Posi- tions	Av. salary
<b>PERSONAL SERVICES, DEPARTMENTAL—continued.</b>						
Clerical, administrative, and fiscal service—Continued.						
Custodial service:						
Grade 1. Junior messenger.....	1	\$600	1	\$600		
Emergency service:						
Grade 19. Senior executive officer.....	6	9,717	6	9,717		
Grade 18. Executive officer.....	1	8,000	1	8,000		
Grade 17. Head administrative officer.....	3	7,333	3	7,333		
Grade 16. Principal economist.....	3	5,600	3	5,600		
Grade 15. Senior administrative officer.....	2	5,350	2	5,350		
Grade 14. Senior administrative officer.....	3	4,933	3	4,933		
Senior economist.....	4	4,600	4	4,600		
Grade 13. Administrative officer.....	1	4,200	1	4,200		
Economist.....	1	4,200	1	4,200		
Senior accountant.....	1	4,000	1	4,000		
Grade 12. Junior administrative officer.....	1	3,800	1	3,800		
Senior accountant.....	1	3,800	1	3,800		
Grade 9. Junior administrative assistant.....	5	2,600	5	2,600		
Assistant economist.....	3	2,600	3	2,600		
Junior accountant.....	1	2,600	1	2,600		
Grade 7. Junior economist.....	1	2,000	1	2,000		
Total permanent, departmental.....	230	569,160	230	569,160		
Temporary employees, departmental.....		3,263,432		4,351,142		
All personal services, departmental.....		3,832,592		4,920,302		
<b>PERSONAL SERVICES, FIELD</b>						
Clerical, administrative, and fiscal service:						
Grade 2. Junior calculating machine operator.....	1	1,440	1	1,440		
Emergency service:						
Grade 5. Senior stenographer.....	1	1,620	1	1,620		
Total permanent, field.....	2	3,060	2	3,060		
Temporary employees, field.....		35,085		46,780		
All personal services, field.....		38,145		49,840		
Total, departmental and field.....		3,870,737		4,970,142		
Deduct legislative reductions.....				745,519		
01 Personal services (net).....		3,870,737		4,224,623		
<b>OTHER OBLIGATIONS</b>						
02 Supplies and materials.....		199,210		265,610		
05 Communication service.....		65,670		87,560		
06 Travel expenses.....		422,411		563,215		
07 Transportation of things.....		11,250		15,000		
08 Printing and binding.....		100,000		234,430		
10 Furnishing of heat, light, power, water, and electricity.....		3,500		3,500		
11 Rents.....		179,650		239,633		
12 Repairs and alterations.....		18,000		24,000		
13 Special and miscellaneous current expense.....		2,000		3,000		
2271 Agricultural rental and benefit payments.....		649,000,000		724,276,400		
2272 Removal of surplus agricultural products.....		52,000,000		85,000,000		
30 Equipment.....		50,000		103,477		
Total other obligations.....		702,051,691		810,815,725		
Grand total obligations.....		705,922,428		815,040,348		
Add amounts transferred to:						
Bureau of Internal Revenue (Treasury Department).....		+125,000,000		+33,500,000		
Office of the Treasurer (Treasury Department).....		+100,000		+100,000		
Add amounts reimbursed to bureaus for work done:						
Extension Service.....				+6,457,520		
Bureau of Agricultural Economics.....				+189,743		
Bureau of Animal Industry.....				+87,100		
Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine.....				+3,900		
Bureau of Chemistry and Soils.....				+1,200		
Net total obligations.....		\$831,022,428		\$855,379,811		
Deduct obligation in excess of estimate.....				-855,379,811		
Total estimate or appropriation.....		831,022,428				
<b>BY PROJECTS</b>						
Effectuating reduction in acreage or reduction in the production for market or both.....		658,022,428		738,379,811		
Removal of agricultural surpluses.....		53,000,000		87,000,000		
Refunds of taxes.....		120,000,000		30,000,000		
Total.....		831,022,428		855,379,811		

1 Exclusive of estimated expenditures of \$37,000,000 payable from N. R. A. allotments.

## SPECIAL FUND

Proceeds from processing taxes, Agricultural Adjustment Administration:

SEC. 12 (b). In addition to the foregoing (see appropriation under sec. 12 (a), p. —), the proceeds derived from all taxes imposed under this title are hereby appropriated to be available to the Secretary of Agriculture for expansion of markets and removal of surplus agricultural products and the following purposes under part 2 of this title: Administrative expenses, rental and benefit payments, and refunds on taxes. The Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Treasury shall jointly estimate from time to time the amounts, in addition to any money available under subsection (a), currently required for such purposes; and the Secretary of the Treasury shall, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, advance to the Secretary of Agriculture the amounts so estimated. (See preceding indefinite appropriation.) The amount of any such advance shall be deducted from such tax proceeds as shall subsequently become available under this subsection (Agricultural Adjustment Act, Public, No. 10, 73d Cong., May 12, 1933, 48 Stat., p. 38).

Permanent appropriation, special fund:

Special deposits (cotton):

This fund operates to take care of the financial transactions in connection with the acquisition and disposition of spot cotton and cotton futures contracts by the Secretary of Agriculture, as provided for by part 1, title I, of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, approved May 12, 1933, and the disposition of the proceeds from the sale of such cotton holdings as follows:

(a) The excess of the sales price at which options are exercised over 6 cents per pound (the price at which the Secretary of Agriculture sells cotton to producers) is paid to producers.

(b) The 1-cent excess of the price at which the Secretary sells cotton to producers (6 cents) over the purchase price of the cotton from the Farm Credit Administration (5 cents basis price) is to be used to cover the carrying charges on the cotton holdings.

No acreage payments or administrative expenses are disbursed from this fund.

The following is a statement of the receipts and disbursements from this fund for the period July 25 to October 31, 1933:

## RECEIPTS

Loans from banks and Reconstruction Finance Corporation (face value).....	\$33,300,000.00
Payments made by Farm Credit Administration to apply on future contracts assumed.....	19,018,065.00
Return of margins deposited with banks and brokers.....	5,342,700.00
Sales of spot cotton.....	471,876.93
Amount received from American Cotton Cooperative Association account of futures transactions.....	4,605.00
Insurance refund (spot cotton).....	3,085.91
	<u>58,140,332.84</u>

## DISBURSEMENTS

Margins deposited with banks and brokers.....	19,886,500.00
Payments made to Farm Credit Administration to cover purchase price of spot cotton.....	30,778,450.95
Refund made to Farm Credit Administration, account of adjustment of purchase price of futures contracts assumed.....	221,795.00
Storage charges (carrying costs).....	124,029.70
Warehouse charges assumed by Farm Credit Administration.....	1,326,680.64
Landing costs assumed by Farm Credit Administration.....	140,590.27
Insurance charges (carrying costs).....	39,312.84
Insurance charges assumed by Farm Credit Administration.....	23,295.90
Interest and discount (\$116,328.18 deducted from face value of loans).....	157,165.68
Repayment of loans.....	325,000.00
Miscellaneous costs.....	790.32
	<u>53,023,611.30</u>

Balance Oct. 31, 1933..... 5,116,721.54

This fund does not depend upon any appropriation for replenishment, as in the final analysis the proceeds from the sale of cotton holdings will presumably take care of—

1. The repayment of all loans.
2. The carrying charges on the cotton.
3. Payments due producers by virtue of their option contracts.

The receipts and disbursements for this fund during subsequent periods will depend almost entirely upon—

1. Sales of cotton holdings.
2. Payments to producers on account of options exercised.
3. Loans made.
4. Loans repaid.

The fixed monthly carrying costs on the present stock of spot cotton is approximately as follows:

1. Storage charges.....	\$200,000
2. Insurance charges.....	20,000

Total..... 220,000

Total under Agricultural Adjustment Administration:

Estimate 1935, \$831,022,428.

Appropriated 1934, \$100,000,000.

Revised 1934, \$955,379,811.

By objects	Obligations		
	Estimate, 1935	Estimate, 1934	Actual, 1933
Allocation of \$37,000,000 to supplement the proceeds derived from processing taxes levied under sec. 220 of the National Industrial Recovery Act:			
2271 Rental and benefit payments.....		\$37,000,000	
Deduct amount received by transfer from Federal Emergency Administration of Public Works.....		-37,000,000	
Total estimate or appropriation.....			
<b>BY PROJECTS</b>			
Effectuating reduction in acreage or reduction in the production for market or both.....		37,000,000	

Total, Department of Agriculture, [\$100,209,091] \$68,646,234:

Estimate 1935, \$897,668,662.

Appropriated 1934, \*\$210,512,207.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. President, in these estimates, going to the detailed break-down, I find that there are included therein, under subdivisions 2271 and 2272, the following items:

	1934	1935
Estimated obligations:		
(2271) Agricultural rental and benefit payments:		
Cotton.....	\$242,236,000	\$130,000,000
Wheat.....	102,000,000	102,000,000
Corn hogs.....	328,000,000	365,000,000
Tobacco.....	39,040,400	39,000,000
Dairy.....	13,000,000	13,000,000
Total.....	724,276,400	649,000,000
(2272) Removal of surplus agricultural products:		
Wheat.....	8,000,000	10,000,000
Corn hogs.....	65,000,000	30,000,000
Dairy.....	12,000,000	12,000,000
Total.....	85,000,000	52,000,000

From the Consumers' Guide, issued under date of April 9, 1934, by the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, I quote as follows:

Returns from processing taxes are meeting Budget estimates and will provide revenue sufficient to finance the adjustment programs now in operation and approved surplus removal purchases. Expenditures to be incurred will total \$859,350,000. Collections are estimated at \$863,595,000.

Now I turn to the Treasury's statement of April 14, which is the latest I have, and I find that the processing tax, from its inception to the present date, on all commodities on which it has been levied, has amounted to \$265,758,881.85. For 14 days of April it has amounted to \$27,752,973.28. If we estimate the amount for the next 2 months and a half at \$50,000,000 or \$60,000,000, and take the total expenditures as I have heretofore shown, as estimated by the departments themselves, and as given publicity by their own publications, I contend that there is still shown a deficit of approximately half a billion dollars. I do not see how it can be figured otherwise.

Let us see what the expenditures have been for the same period. Agricultural Adjustment Administration to date, April 14, \$234,578,421.54. That is the item Secretary Wallace used. He did not use any other item. But I find in note 1, page 3, which refers to the monthly statement which is published only on the 15th day of each month—and unless one knows where it is, he probably will not ever see it—that there is shown an additional expenditure of \$78,000,000.

Now I come to the emergency expenditures. I have never known how to keep books with the right hand not knowing what the left hand was doing. I have always thought one ought to have a complete set of books, and keep them all together, and that one should know from his books how much he owed, how much his receipts were, and, if there was a deficit, how much it was.

\* Includes \$100,000,000 appropriated for Agricultural Adjustment Administration.

I find here:

Agricultural Adjustment Administration, \$60,574,167.69.

Therefore, I still contend that there is no question but that the Agricultural Adjustment Administration is running a tremendous deficit, and that by the 30th day of June it will probably reach more than half a billion dollars.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. DICKINSON. I yield.

Mr. FESS. I have in my hand the Treasury daily report, and I have experienced difficulty, from this statement, in keeping track of the finances. I wonder what would happen to the Secretary of the Treasury if the Treasury were under the rigid requirements of the national securities measure which we passed sometime ago. What would be the penalty?

Mr. DICKINSON. I do not think, from the way the Treasury statement is kept at the present time, it could possibly comply with 10 percent of the regulations and requirements imposed under the new securities bill. I suggest, further, that I do not believe that the Treasury system of bookkeeping would be approved by the Federal Trade Commission on the part of my individual or corporate business in the United States.

Mr. FESS. It certainly is not in keeping with the securities measure we passed.

Mr. DICKINSON. That is certainly true.

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

Mr. DICKINSON. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not know whether the Senator's figures are correct, or whether those of the Department are correct, but my experience with the departments, during a long term of office, has led me to believe that the departments are usually correct.

Mr. DICKINSON. These are all department figures; I am using nothing but department figures.

Mr. McKELLAR. But the Senator is taking the figures from one department and comparing them with the figures from another department. I think we can safely take the figures as given out by the Department of Agriculture. I do not believe that Secretary Wallace would give out a statement which was not backed absolutely by the facts, and my judgment is that if the Senator had telephoned to Secretary Wallace and had asked about the matter, he would not have gotten into the trouble he seems to be in over these figures.

Mr. DICKINSON. Let me suggest to the Senator from Tennessee that Secretary Wallace did not telephone me about the figures. If he had, he would not have gotten into the trouble into which he has fallen in getting out the figures.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think that when the true facts and true figures are given, the Secretary of Agriculture will not be shown to be in any trouble about the matter. It is going to be the Senator, and not the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. DICKINSON. I shall not be in any trouble about it.

Mr. McKELLAR. On several occasions I have taken issue with the departments, and I have usually found the departments very accurate about giving out figures. I do not believe the Secretary of Agriculture would give out inaccurate or improper figures.

Mr. DICKINSON. For the benefit of the Senator from Tennessee I will read the statement of Secretary Wallace, and then I will show him in the Treasury statement what the Secretary failed to take into consideration; and he was quoting the Treasury statement.

Secretary WALLACE. I have checked up on that because I read it in the paper. You can check on this yourselves from the daily statement of the United States Treasury.

That is what I am using, and that is what he was using.

On page 2 you will find under "Receipts" the collections from processing taxes on farm products. For March 30—the last one that I have—the collections were \$237,701,000 and expenditures were \$228,927,000. So the collections so far have been about \$9,000,000 more than the expenditures. I think it would be a much healthier situation if we had been able to get into action and have greater expenditures than collections.

In other words, he apparently welcomes an overdraft.

I think there would have been greater recovery if we had found it possible to do that. I think it is rather remarkable that the thing is so nearly in balance as at this time, because the essence of the plan was really in the early part of it to spend faster than to collect and make it up by the taxes later on. Of course, when the corn-hog program gets into action there will be more money paid out to the farmers than had been recovered in the United States Treasury.

What I am suggesting, and all I am suggesting, is that he quotes one figure but leaves out the emergency expenditures of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, which amount to over \$60,000,000. He fails to take into account the note on page 3, which tells us to go to the semimonthly statement made with reference to expenditures, which shows, for the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, \$78,000,000 of expenditures.

I do not like to have the Secretary of Agriculture give out part of the figures without giving out all. If some of these expenditures are not the usual expenditures of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, very well, let him say so; but they appear here under the heading, "Agricultural Adjustment Administration."

On top of that I want to suggest that, from the record I have inserted, which is the Budget record, there can be no question about what they estimate expending. I am not criticizing that. What I am saying is that they are trying to give out the impression that they are collecting more money than they are expending, when, as a matter of fact, they have been advanced from the Treasury \$450,000,000. They have collected only \$265,000,000 to date. They have one month and a half to go. Therefore there is no possibility of the collections reaching the \$855,000,000, which is the amount estimated by the Budget and which is over Secretary Wallace's signature.

I do not desire to criticize Secretary Wallace; I only want him, whenever he criticizes me, to give all the facts. I am giving them from the very Treasury statement from which he quoted.

In addition to what I have said I desire to suggest that this Budget estimate shows the following:

Appropriations for 1934, none. Revised estimates for 1934, \$855,379,811.

Which, added to the \$100,000,000 already appropriated, makes \$955,379,811 for the fiscal year 1934.

What I want to say is simply this: The administrators of the law are responsible for carrying out its provisions, and it will not do for them to make any effort to evade responsibility under this law. They have down there now 531 employees; 160 of them temporary. They have under the permanent indefinite appropriations 232 employees. I find that salaries of those employees run from \$10,000 a year down, all of them being paid to tell the farmer how to do something they themselves do not know how to do. I do not know what the result will be. It is a great experiment. But what I want to say is that when they give out figures, we want them to give out all the figures, and not part of the figures, and any effort to try to evade by leaving items out of a statement or confusing fiscal years will not answer.

Oh, what a tangled web we weave,  
When first we practice to deceive.

If the "brain trusters" are no better in formulating safe economic theories for social reform and national planning, than they are in taking into account all of the necessary items in figuring out a financial statement, how long will it take the "brain trusters" to become the Nation's busters!

Mr. LEWIS obtained the floor.

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

Mr. LEWIS. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, let me make a suggestion to the Senator from Iowa. I am quite sure the accurate figures from the Department will not sustain the Senator's position. The Senator talks about "brain trusters." Has the Senator had enough of criticism of "brain trusters" in the last few days since every statement Dr. Wirt made has been disproved? It seems to me the Senator

should wait a little while before bringing other charges against the administration. The last experience has not been so good. The Senator remembers that a week or two ago Senators on the Republican side of the aisle were all talking about Dr. Wirt, and about the "brain trusters", and about what a wonderful work Dr. Wirt had done, but in the last few days they have not had anything to say, because every statement Dr. Wirt has made has been discounted, if not actually disproved.

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

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not have the floor. I am asking the Senator a question.

Mr. DICKINSON. I want to suggest that I had nothing to do with Dr. Wirt.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am glad the Senator disowns him.

Mr. DICKINSON. I never knew the man. I do say that if the Senator will read the testimony where the six people who appeared before the House committee were cross-examined, I think he will find that all of them admitted they belonged to the communistic organization. I think it will make splendid reading for people who are thinking about whether or not we are drifting off into a rather dangerous field.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. LEWIS. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not so read the testimony before the committee of the House. My reading of the testimony shows me that every statement that Dr. Wirt made has been disproved and I do not believe any Senator on either side of the aisle would defend him in view of the fact that 6 people, I think 3 men and 3 women, who have been in the departments here for years, who were not appointed by this administration but were appointed under the Hoover administration, denied Dr. Wirt's statements.

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

Mr. LEWIS. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I do not wish to delay the remarks with which my friend from Illinois is about to enlighten the Senate. I should like to invite the attention of the Senator from Iowa to the fact that apparently the leading lady member of the party, while she may have become communistic, has been hitherto registered as a Kansas Republican, and appointed by President Coolidge.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; and why anyone would make such charges as Dr. Wirt made is incomprehensible to me, and I am very happy that the Senator from Iowa disclaims any defense of Dr. Wirt. I do not think that anyone will, under the circumstances, defend him. He simply made statements which he could not possibly prove, but every one of which, on the other hand, has been disproved.

I was sorry to see the Senator from Iowa, after having to back track all along the line because of Dr. Wirt's statement, immediately conjure up another attack upon a member of the administration, to wit, the Secretary of Agriculture, a citizen of his own State, an honorable, upright man who hitherto was a Republican and whom I believe to be an honest man. I do not believe he has undertaken in the slightest way to misrepresent the facts and figures from his Department; and when the Senator from Iowa examines the subject further, as I hope he will, I believe he will exonerate the Secretary of Agriculture from having made any misleading statements or given out any misleading figures.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. LEWIS. I yield.

Mr. DICKINSON. I want to suggest that the Senator from Tennessee has not read the cross-examination by Mr. McGugin, of Kansas, of the various witnesses who appeared before the House committee yesterday. I believe it will appear in the Record in the speech of Mr. McGugin, of Kansas. I know nothing about these people or where they come from. I never heard of most of them until they were supposed to be at the Wirt party, but I do understand that most of them admitted they were members of the Com-

munist Party. Other than that, I do not care to comment on them. I am not here to defend Dr. Wirt or to criticize him.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois further yield?

Mr. LEWIS. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am glad the Senator from Iowa will not defend Dr. Wirt. I am glad he says he does not defend Dr. Wirt. Everyone knows that the bubble had burst when Dr. Wirt left the first page of the newspapers and yesterday got over to the fifth or sixth page. Of course, he is out, and there is no one who will defend him. In my judgment, there is not a Senator on the other side of the Chamber or on this side of the Chamber who will defend the statements of this propagandist and ill-advised talker.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. LEWIS. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I will ask the Senator from Tennessee if it is not a fact that the Senator from Iowa loudly protests that he does not know anything about Dr. Wirt and is not interested in Dr. Wirt, but he proceeds to denounce all six of the witnesses who demonstrated the fact that Dr. Wirt—

Mr. DICKINSON. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. No. Permit me to finish asking the question.

Mr. DICKINSON. I did not denounce them. I simply stated what was shown by the testimony of the witnesses on cross-examination before the House committee, and that is all I now say. I am not denouncing them, or defending them, or anything of that kind. The Senator from Texas can go outside the record and make more erroneous statements than anyone else of whom I know in the Senate.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Iowa can go outside of all reasonable bounds more quickly and more often than any Senator of whom I know. I will ask the Senator if it is not true that while loudly protesting that he has no sympathy at all for Dr. Wirt he denounces the six witnesses who demonstrated that Dr. Wirt was a fourflusher and a falsifier, and says they are Communists. I wonder why this darling of the Republican side, under the leadership of the Senator from Iowa, Dr. Wirt, is associating with all these terrible Communists, why he is breaking bread with them, why he is dining with them, and why it is when they demonstrate that Dr. Wirt is a fourflusher and a falsifier the Senator should denounce those witnesses.

It is suggested that the individuals in question were appointed under a Republican administration. That may be true, but the Senator from Iowa did not have anything to do with it.

Mr. DICKINSON. They are your babies.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Iowa is not responsible for their appointment, even if they were appointed under a Republican administration.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Haltigan, one of its clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 2811. An act to authorize the incorporated city of Juneau, Alaska, to undertake certain municipal public works, including regrading and paving streets and sidewalks, installation of sewer and water pipes, bridge construction and replacement, construction of concrete bulkheads, and construction of refuse incinerator, and for such purposes to issue bonds in any sum not exceeding \$103,000;

S. 2812. An act to authorize the incorporated city of Skagway, Alaska, to construct, reconstruct, replace, and install a water-distribution system, and for such purposes to issue bonds in any sum not exceeding \$40,000;

S. 2813. An act to authorize the incorporated town of Wrangell, Alaska, to undertake certain municipal public works, including construction, reconstruction, enlargement, extension, and improvements of its water-supply system; construction of a retaining wall and to backfill behind same to make a permanent street; and construction, reconstruct-

tion, enlargement, extension, and improvements to sewers, and for such purposes to issue bonds in any sum not exceeding \$51,000; and

H.R. 3521. An act to reduce certain fees in naturalization proceedings, and for other purposes.

FOREIGN SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY FUND

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLARK in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

I transmit herewith a report by the Secretary of State showing all receipts and disbursements on account of refunds, allowances, and annuities for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1933, in connection with the Foreign Service retirement and disability system, as required by section 26 (a) of an act for the grading and classification of clerks in the Foreign Service of the United States of America and providing compensation therefor, approved February 23, 1931.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, April 18, 1934.

[Enclosure: Report concerning retirement and disability fund, Foreign Service.]

ASPECT OF EMBARRASSMENT IN FOREIGN DEBTS AND RECIPROCAL TARIFF AGREEMENTS

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, I am loath to enter into foreign subjects in this home-products discussion, or disturb this contribution of pastoral and bucolic statesmanship suggested by the debates between these eminent leaders lately holding forth. Still, if I am not intruding too far upon the patience of the Senate, I want to indulge in observations which it was my intention to enter upon earlier in the day.

Mr. President, we have had before us today and yesterday bills carrying very important subjects, one being taxation, the other being sugar. Both present very serious situations, and can be carried to such an extent so as to sometimes lead to complicated and oftentimes disastrous results.

We are reminded that when O'Connell met a gentleman who had been in Ireland, and having asked him how he liked Ireland, and received reply saying, "Its weather and sunshine were beautiful", upon which O'Connell answered, "Don't tell it in London, or they'll tax it." Sir, while we seek light on further taxation, we do not tax further light.

Mr. President, indulging in thoughts on the subject of sugar, my mind reflects that it is a persuasive and luxurious topic. History informs us that William Pitt, Premier of England, arising in his place in Parliament to discuss sugar, would by the mere pronunciation of the word "sugar" awaken the admiration and worship of the women who sat in the special gallery. I have been inclined to feel that the manner in which the subject has been discussed today, coming down finally to Dr. Wirt, has had a considerable influence in awakening the attention of those who fairly crowd our gallery, in very fair attire, and fair among themselves, though I do not regard the Wirt discussion as Wirty of the Senate. [Laughter.]

I am compelled to depart from subjects of so gentle and attractive a nature to invite the attention of the Senate and of the fourth house to what I feel is an admission, as gathered from the cables today, of a very serious import to the United States and to the program as is now suggested of legislation we enter upon tomorrow. I refer to the tariff bill, with its reciprocity treaty clauses.

The public papers bring us weighty news which confirms private intelligence which can be had from the State Department as to the debtors to the United States. I refer to the large debtors known as "our European debtors", not only as to the debts incurred during the war for loans for carrying on their martial conflict but for loans which were incurred for money borrowed after the war and lent in the graciousness and generosity of our nature to aid the industries and revive the languishing commerce of our debtor lands. It is announced that one of the great countries—

and I refer to Great Britain—presents a financial report disclosing a very large surplus in her treasury, which far exceeds her debts and surpassing in amount any quantity that may be exacted by the demands of her budget. But it is to be seen for the first time in 7 years that Britain declines to enter into the budget any note or memorandum of payments due on installments or express any reference whatever as to the obligation of debts she owes the United States of America. For magnanimous and meticulous England this omission is so startling as to be ominous.

At the same time comes forth the expression from royal-natured France, in connection with what she calls the balancing of her budget as to this touching debt, our usually fair and just good friend asserts that there are no debts between France and the United States. With a trophy in expression she wipes them out. Italy finds it agreeable to express herself along similar lines but not so didactic, an expression of complete assurance, defying any dispute. Italy merely regrets that the United States should assume to press for any payment, the lingering item of a few hundred millions.

Mr. President, on this floor but a few days past I made bold to say that this desertion and defiance would follow. This was when the statesmen of England in public place but last week announced that they would not pay another dollar or, as the other statesmen said, they would make a proposition to the United States as a final one, as an adjustment of every debt, and, if not accepted, they would probably announce in the exact words of France that they "default." We find now at the expiration of the following week that when the proposition of their budget is presented to their country, these foreign debtor lands keep exact faith with the threat they posed against America, all done in a spirit of acknowledged brotherhood but in the expression of a new conception of their relation to us, the United States, as creditor.

It becomes interesting to us to seek the reason or what we can righteously deduce as the reason why these countries contemporaneously and in unity, as though it were following some preceding meeting, all concur in the same thought and unite in the same undertaking. We answer that the real reason is that their eminent statesmen have noted that from both sides of this Senate Chamber comes the announcement that what is called the "tariff bill" will be entered upon at once. That in such bill is a provision which authorizes the President of the United States to negotiate treaties with countries respecting the range of tariff, the quality and quantity of percentage tax, or for the exchange of products between the two nations through treaty negotiated solely by the President, as envoy for the Nation of America.

Mr. President, I assume to charge that what is in the minds of these eminent statesmen is to me new opportunity, which pressed means new victory. They see that the United States is on the eve of presenting a proposition of negotiating with them, through a treaty that shall offer something in exchange for them yielding to us, first, the melting away of the barriers against our products, or the surrendering, or the reducing of the figure of charge which in the name of tariffs they have heretofore been addressing against us and promising to continue in more drastic insistence than ever before.

Let it be remembered that the statesmen of those countries are the reflex and heirs of the statesmen who came down through history for a thousand years, and all with a common purpose to obtain victory by delusion or enforced distress. These modern masters of diplomacy know that it is in the balancing and tilting one with another that results are incubated. It will be remembered that such example is the record of all, whether we have in mind Talleyrand of France, Machiavelli of Italy, or the adroit Austrian, Metternich. Sir, in the doings of today we have the exact repetition of the manner and method of their fathers of statecraft. These nations who owe us money are now prepared to present to the United States the bold proposition, "Gentlemen, in your proposal for treaty you cannot deal with us by stationing us as an inferior." They secretly proclaim in symbol

of conduct, "You cannot have a treaty of negotiation with us except on the basis of equality. In order that we shall have equality with you, you will wipe out the obligation that makes us a debtor to you. We will not tolerate the position of you remaining a creditor, we the debtor, while we languish in a subordinate situation, subverted from dignity of independence to one of groveling inferiority, and as such you negotiate with us while you hold over us the power to compel us to surrender under the threat either of enforcing the debt or as an exchange for some reduction or extension of it." Their course is to assert by situation the counsel of Warwick to Hastings, "Courtesy to all but servility to none."

Mr. President, these eminent debtors—and we might as well confront the fact in this presence today—are now preparing, even before we enter upon negotiation, to demand of us that we pledge them in equality as negotiators; they first declare they are under no obligation to us, admit that we are under none to them. By this status they declare, for the first time since the World War, an equality of financial situation between us.

Mr. President, it may appear to you that prophecies and translations of mine are figments of fear. I invite your attention to a bit of parallel history of our own. When President Taft sought to negotiate with Canada what we have often termed a "reciprocity treaty", the first thing Canada did was the natural and statesmanlike thing. She, acting under the advice of the British Empire, reminded the United States that we had charged her with having seized our sealing ships, in violation of the international sealing law, and called to mind that we had stimulated the owners of these ships to sue Canada for damages for the value of these ships which she had condemned in her courts and ordered confiscated by her process of judicature. Before we reached any degree of consideration of the reciprocity treaty, however, we came to terms at London respecting the obligations we had assumed to put upon Canada.

I speak of the subject rather sentimentally, Mr. President. I was a participant as counsel in some of that litigation. There came out of it a result, sir, whereby one of the clients was, in glee of success, generous enough to name one of the ships the *James Hamilton Lewis*; and the prize, true to her namesake, in her very first act was to get into crime and get caught, and likewise to be penalized and confiscated by the Government. [Laughter.] The record is here in the State Department.

You will readily understand how naturally to my memory there arises the details of the transaction, but we turn for a moment upon a more serious phase of a similar situation. We approached Germany. We desired that Germany accept the pork of the United States in exchange for the barley of Germany which we sought, and which she sought to sell us. Breweries of the United States were legal those days.

In the meantime, however, eminent Senators around here recall that there had been some grievance between ourselves and Germany, touching that which had transpired under a certain administration as to Brazil. Germany had invaded Brazil in some form of transaction; and, as we insisted, impressed some American interests, to the loss of our country. Germany, through her statesmen, after the order of the day of the past, and in fulfillment of the inherited generation, demanded first, before we negotiated on the subject, that we remove these obstructions, that we might stand equal. Senators will recall that we subsequently came to some terms, the details of which I am unable to reveal, yet complied with before we reached the point of an understanding between ourselves and Germany upon the mere exchange of these two products, the pork from America and the barley from Germany, all at a time when the process of "pork barrels" in legislation were familiar to us.

But, sir, it is to be recalled that a more serious experience abounded. My eminent friends, the Senators here, from the Pacific Coast States, cannot fail to recall that when we moved upon Japan to have Japan receive the goods of the United States under some bilateral arrangement, Japan very artfully and with commendable skill, following the precedents to which I am alluding, called our attention to the fact that we had been keeping her people out of our country

under a treaty of exclusion, and demanded, before we proceeded upon that doctrine of the commercial exchange, that we right what she considered a wrong to her. We could not repeal the law. That would have violated the very theory of our Government. We could not make an exchange of citizen for citizen, for that would have worked as we believed a disadvantage our people could not accept. So, finally, what did we do? We surrendered by allowing an amendment known, if you recall, dear Senators, as a "gentlemen's agreement", by which we included more of the Japanese under the designation of "scholars", and thus the arrangement was effected, and for the first time Japan felt, or assumed to feel, that she could, on equal terms, deal with us respecting the possible imports from our country and our exports to her, to which I refer.

Mr. President, I cannot overlook the fact that what we are seeing now is but a duplication of these recited situations. Sir, this present condition calls for great consideration. If we are to vote the President the right to negotiate these treaties we must vote him, at the same time, complete power respecting these treaties, enabling him to meet whatever propositions are made as a consideration for accepting our offer. We must give him the power to receive the propositions of these nations respecting either the cancelation of the debts or their establishing new limitation and reduction. The debtor nations will surely present the terms as a necessary condition precedent to dealing with us. This will be put on the necessity to place them upon what may be termed an absolute equality of negotiation. More than that, sir, it will not do that this honorable body should assume that each counterproposition submitted in the negotiation is as fast as tendered to be sent to us—the Senate—for such procedure would consume 1 year in debate from item to item, and again item to item. The respective differences that eminent Senators here entertain upon the tariff question would provoke the limitless discussion—and repercussion. We would be debating the question until, sir, such time would pass as would defeat any benefit from the conclusion. Nor, sir, could we surround the opportunity given to the President with a forbidding declaration as to receiving propositions on other subjects besides those contained in the treaty yet defined in their proffer. Therefore, there must accompany the power we give him nothing, sir, that will limit him from dealing with all subjects insofar as they may be received in propositions from those who undoubtedly are now prepared to tender to us, as a condition precedent, as a favor to themselves—either the abolishing the debts or releasing immediate demand for their collection; sirs, the proposition will be as a demand upon us before the nation debtor will enter upon the consideration of reciprocity of trade by treaty.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLARK in the chair). Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. LEWIS. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. FESS. I did not understand the Senator's statement when he referred to the power we are to give the President. Does it extend to authority to cancel the debts?

Mr. LEWIS. No. I answer the Senator from Ohio that he, the Senator, is now thrumming, I may say, the discordant string in this harp of arrangement. We cannot give the President the power to cancel the debts. We cannot give the President the power to limit them or reduce them in violation of the specific act of Congress which has been passed giving direction in that regard. It is the law for him as it is for us. It is only by changing that law, and giving him specific direction by a change of an act of the Congress, that he could have the power to undertake anything that would reduce the debts or cancel them. This is my answer. In my statement just pronounced I am referring, I may say, only to the right to receive the propositions that other nations would have to offer in exchange for treaties with us, but not finally to close them.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, would it interrupt the Senator if I should ask him a question?

Mr. LEWIS. Not at all.

Mr. FESS. Some days ago, when the Senator addressed the country on this subject, he referred to the possibility of receiving bonds from our debtors and later making proper disposition of those bonds. That colloquy in the Senate has created considerable public interest.

Mr. LEWIS. I may say to my able friend, so I have learned from clippings of papers from abroad, as well as from home.

Mr. FESS. I received a communication from one of the country's great thinkers who commented upon the suggestion and said that he did not believe we could accept goods in payment of the debts, and he doubted whether we could secure money in payment of the debts, but surely we could receive services in payment of the debts; and then he proceeded to explain what he meant. When American tourists go to Europe a certain amount of money is carried from America to Europe. Instead of that money going from America to Europe to be used as Europe's money, this gentleman suggested that it ought to be deposited to the credit of this Government on its debt by the use of a particular kind of currency. The same thing could be done in the payment of freight rates in commerce on the sea, and the same thing could be done on triangular business transactions. I cannot see the practicability of the suggestion; but his idea was that an arrangement could be made whereby the money that goes from America in the trade with Europe in the items I have suggested could be credited upon the debt, without Europe's calling upon a single dollar of her own except as she gets it from this country.

It is the Senator's discussion that gave rise to that suggestion. I should like to have the Senator look into it. The practicability of it is a question with me, and so I stated to the friend who wrote me.

Mr. LEWIS. Of course, the Senator realizes that the sum total of the proposition is as though it were to say, by the debtor, "Whatever money you Americans bring over here and expend in trading here we return to you to be applied on the debt." I say to my able friend from Ohio, many propositions no doubt will be made; and that is why I feel that liberty should be given the President to receive these propositions instead of their being made at a long distance either to the Treasury or to Congress. In receiving them, however, he is to receive them as their propositions, but he is not to close them in violation of the act of Congress. They are to be sent through him to us, or to his Congress.

This much is what I had intended, sir, to conclude upon: I may be pardoned for assuming a great seriousness to my own utterance, but matters have come to the point where the President of the United States may take from his very humble followers—in this body and elsewhere who dare offer counsel—this admonition: He must be prepared to meet the suggestion to him that "You either dispose of these debts, sir, or we will not enter upon the possibility of reciprocity treaties", adding, "We are not called on to do it. We can furnish our own people. We may live among ourselves. Our nations are rising. We do not need your American goods. If any need, it is for very few of them. More of ours you need. It is you, the United States, who need to sell to us." Therefore the President must early learn that if the proposal is to be made that as a consideration for their entering upon treaties with us or their accepting any treaty from us there must first be cancelation of the indebtedness, the President must understand that the voice of his Congress is against yielding to it. He must understand that his people would not consent to have the debts canceled as a consideration for entering upon mere treaties. These treaties in themselves as to foreign debtors would be mere promises of trade. These foreign nations must be given to know that our country would not yield to such propositions as I have divined. Let it be understood early that our President has no intention of presenting such a proposition for the United States, and that even if his generosity were extended to a point opposing his patriotism it would be repudiated. But we need not dwell on this fear of his countrymen. The President would not arouse the suspicions of his countrymen, intimating that he or his allied legislators are

on the eve of finding some specious device in which the people can be delivered, the debts due them canceled, and losses imposed upon them beyond measure.

Mr. President, I cannot but conclude that it is very timely for us, on either side of this Chamber, to early inform the distinguished President that we quite see the purpose of these eminent nations in refusing to include in their budgets the debts due us, or even to acknowledge the need of a payment, and, conscious as they are that \$180,000,000 from one is due within a few days, not even to allude to it, and that another nation would simply didactically announce that they owe us nothing; that there is no debt. This means very clearly that they are preparing to suggest terms, as against an effort on our part for a commercial treaty, which terms our country cannot accept, and which if imposed upon the President would humiliate him, and for him to accept would be a surrender unworthy, and which we who know him know that under no condition would he tolerate.

If this method I premise is to be that to be tendered, as plainly, to my mind, is the intention, it were better we discussed it early, and instead of advancing to these nations with a proposition that is to be flouted by the manner in which they receive it, better stand apart upon the dignity of ourselves and the honor of our country and take the fate of our own people, guided by their own wisdom and sustained in their own patriotism.

Mr. President, the hour is upon us when we cry to America, "Stand firm! This is America!" While we herald to the President of the United States, "Whatever course you take, we have confidence that under no condition could you be induced to surrender your country or yield her rights. This, your Congress, as your people, uphold your hands, sustain your body, and around you rally, to again announce to all the world that the United States and its President stand for America."

Mr. President, I thank the Chair and the Senate for their indulgence and devoted attention at this adjourning hour.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. McKELLAR. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

#### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLARK in the chair) laid before the Senate several messages from the President of the United States submitting nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

[For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.]

#### EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, reported favorably the nominations of sundry postmasters, which were ordered to be placed on the calendar.

#### THE CALENDAR—TREATIES PASSED OVER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the calendar is in order.

The legislative clerk proceeded to read Executive B, Seventy-third Congress, second session, an international telecommunication convention, the general radio regulations annexed thereto, and a separate radio protocol, all signed by the delegates of the United States to the International Radio Conference at Madrid on December 9, 1932.

Mr. McKELLAR. I suggest that that go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the treaty will be passed over.

The legislative clerk proceeded to read Executive C, Seventy-third Congress, second session, a protocol, signed at Rome on April 21, 1926, and effective on January 1, 1927, substituting new paragraphs for paragraphs 3 and 4 of article 10 of the convention of June 7, 1905, creating the International Institute of Agriculture at Rome.

Mr. McKELLAR. I make the same request with regard to this treaty.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the treaty will be passed over.

#### THE JUDICIARY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John B. Ponder to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

#### IN THE ARMY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations for appointments in the Army.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Army be confirmed en bloc.

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

#### RECESS

Mr. LEWIS. I move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, April 19, 1934, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### NOMINATIONS

*Executive nominations received by the Senate April 18 (legislative day of Apr. 17), 1934*

#### ADDITIONAL COUNSEL OF THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

William A. Roberts, of the District of Columbia, to be an additional counsel of the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia, to be known as the people's counsel, for a term of 4 years, vice Richmond B. Keech.

#### POSTMASTERS

##### ALABAMA

Elmer H. Carter to be postmaster at Castleberry, Ala., in place of C. D. Price. Incumbent's commission expired May 10, 1933.

William P. Tartt to be postmaster at Livingston, Ala., in place of W. P. Tartt. Incumbent's commission expired March 18, 1934.

Peyton C. Wilson to be postmaster at Montevallo, Ala., in place of F. F. Crowe, deceased.

James A. Anderson to be postmaster at University, Ala., in place of J. A. Anderson. Incumbent's commission expired March 18, 1934.

##### ALASKA

Harold T. Jestland to be postmaster at Bethel, Alaska. Office became Presidential July 1, 1932.

##### ARIZONA

Charles J. Moody to be postmaster at Superior, Ariz., in place of H. A. King, removed.

##### ARKANSAS

John E. Darr to be postmaster at Atkins, Ark., in place of M. E. Torrence. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1933.

Laura Clements to be postmaster at Cherry Valley, Ark., in place of M. O. Pitts. Incumbent's commission expired December 16, 1933.

W. Ernest King to be postmaster at Clarksville, Ark., in place of A. L. Eustice, resigned.

William G. Jones to be postmaster at Cotton Plant, Ark., in place of S. W. Kennedy. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1933.

John W. Page to be postmaster at Dover, Ark., in place of W. D. Eakes, deceased.

John W. Paschall to be postmaster at Gould, Ark., in place of G. H. Joslyn, Jr. Incumbent's commission expired January 8, 1934.

J. Neil Cooper to be postmaster at Hoxie, Ark., in place of R. C. Lehman, resigned.

J. Dot Fortenberry to be postmaster at Imboden, Ark., in place of J. L. McKamey, removed.

Floy R. Parr to be postmaster at Jonesboro, Ark., in place of J. A. Borgman. Incumbent's commission expired December 11, 1932.

Clarine Billingsley to be postmaster at Kensett, Ark., in place of Bessie Bevill. Incumbent's commission expired April 23, 1932.

Charles C. Kavanaugh to be postmaster at Little Rock, Ark., in place of A. E. Townsend, transferred.

Ethel L. Nall to be postmaster at Lockesburg, Ark., in place of R. F. Locke. Incumbent's commission expired April 23, 1932.

Herbert M. Jackson to be postmaster at Marianna, Ark., in place of L. M. Osborne, removed.

Byron C. Pascoe to be postmaster at Newark, Ark., in place of C. M. Fink, removed.

William F. Elsken to be postmaster at Paris, Ark., in place of L. J. Lee, removed.

Charles K. Coe to be postmaster at Tuckerman, Ark., in place of O. C. Roberts. Incumbent's commission expired December 11, 1932.

Charles C. Snapp to be postmaster at Walnut Ridge, Ark., in place of C. W. White, removed.

Clarence J. Coffin to be postmaster at Wynne, Ark., in place of L. C. Fitzpatrick, removed.

#### CALIFORNIA

Charles Edmond Hogan to be postmaster at Alta Loma, Calif., in place of F. S. Wagner. Incumbent's commission expired December 20, 1932.

James B. Ogden to be postmaster at Avalon, Calif. in place of O. E. Bailey, removed.

Charles E. Day to be postmaster at Avenal, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1932.

Brice H. Gantt to be postmaster at Beaumont, Calif., in place of W. W. Watson. Incumbent's commission expired May 22, 1932.

Joseph V. Gaffey to be postmaster at Burlingame, Calif., in place of J. C. Beard. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1932.

Frederick A. Dickinson to be postmaster at Ben Lomond, Calif., in place of W. H. Nicholson, removed.

Paul O. Martin to be postmaster at Burbank, Calif., in place of G. K. Ketchum. Incumbent's commission expired February 28, 1933.

Harry B. Hooper to be postmaster at Capitola, Calif., in place of L. M. Crump. Incumbent's commission expired May 22, 1932.

John C. Callahan to be postmaster at Chula Vista, Calif., in place of V. A. Uland. Incumbent's commission expired January 26, 1933.

Norris Mellott to be postmaster at Costa Mesa, Calif., in place of W. W. Middleton. Incumbent's commission expired February 28, 1933.

George W. Richards to be postmaster at Culver City, Calif., in place of K. H. McLernon. Incumbent's commission expired December 11, 1932.

Alice D. Scanlon to be postmaster at Colfax, Calif., in place of A. G. Thurman. Incumbent's commission expired January 29, 1933.

Frank J. Roche to be postmaster at Concord, Calif., in place of P. M. Soto, deceased.

Alfred P. Seale to be postmaster at Cottonwood, Calif., in place of D. C. Jamerson. Incumbent's commission expired February 28, 1933.

Mae A. Kibler to be postmaster at Del Mar, Calif., in place of M. A. Kibler. Incumbent's commission expired March 8, 1934.

William Francis Richmond to be postmaster at El Centro, Calif., in place of C. C. Jenkins, removed.

Belle Morgan to be postmaster at Encanto, Calif., in place of Nella Carl, resigned.

Nellie G. Donohoe to be postmaster at Oakland, Calif., in place of W. N. Friend, resigned.

Clarence McCord to be postmaster at Olive View, Calif., in place of F. T. Gossard, resigned.

Thomas M. Day to be postmaster at San Rafael, Calif., in place of C. C. Olmsted. Incumbent's commission expired March 7, 1932.

Edith E. Mason to be postmaster at Santa Fe Springs, Calif., in place of E. E. Mason. Incumbent's commission expired September 30, 1933.

Charles S. Catlin to be postmaster at Saticoy, Calif., in place of C. S. Catlin. Incumbent's commission expired April 2, 1934.

William Clyde Brite to be postmaster at Tehachapi, Calif., in place of F. P. Oakes, removed.

William J. Black to be postmaster at Terminal Island, Calif., in place of Ruby Vinton, transferred.

Harry Bridgewater to be postmaster at Watsonville, Calif., in place of H. W. Judd, removed.

#### COLORADO

Michel A. Vogt to be postmaster at Burlington, Colo., in place of R. L. Wilkinson. Incumbent's commission expired March 18, 1934.

Robert P. James to be postmaster at Cedaredge, Colo., in place of F. J. Stewart, removed.

James O. Stevic to be postmaster at Denver, Colo., in place of F. L. Dodge. Incumbent's commission expired March 18, 1934.

James E. Adams to be postmaster at Englewood, Colo., in place of J. S. Proctor, removed.

Robert R. Lawson to be postmaster at Grover, Colo., in place of R. E. Taylor. Incumbent's commission expired December 16, 1933.

Edward H. Applegate, Jr., to be postmaster at Lamar, Colo., in place of L. M. Markham. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1933.

Myrtle Hufty to be postmaster at Paonia, Colo., in place of D. K. Foster. Incumbent's commission expired December 10, 1932.

Rice A. Palmer to be postmaster at Redcliff, Colo., in place of O. W. Daggett. Incumbent's commission expired February 12, 1931.

Herbert S. Butler to be postmaster at Rico, Colo., in place of A. G. McGee, resigned.

E. Velma Logan to be postmaster at Stratton, Colo., in place of M. G. Quinn. Incumbent's commission expired December 16, 1933.

#### CONNECTICUT

Edward M. Doyle to be postmaster at Bantam, Conn., in place of G. W. Fairgrieve. Incumbent's commission expired December 8, 1932.

George H. Robertson to be postmaster at South Coventry, Conn., in place of L. M. Phillips. Incumbent's commission expired December 16, 1933.

#### DELAWARE

Elmer Layfield to be postmaster at Dagsboro, Del., in place of E. H. Chandler, removed.

Charles F. Wilson to be postmaster at Harrington, Del., in place of H. S. Harrington, removed.

#### FLORIDA

Jerome R. Barnes to be postmaster at Hollywood, Fla., in place of T. S. McNicol, retired.

William P. Wilkinson to be postmaster at New Smyrna, Fla., in place of S. L. Hayes. Incumbent's commission expired January 9, 1934.

Marshall C. Pitts to be postmaster at Okeechobee, Fla., in place of W. N. Gray. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1929.

Leslie D. Reagin to be postmaster at Sarasota, Fla., in place of H. T. Welch. Incumbent's commission expired October 31, 1933.

James E. Wall, Sr., to be postmaster at Tampa, Fla., in place of E. D. Barnard, resigned.

Cornelia Higgins to be postmaster at Warrington, Fla., in place of Cornelia Higgins. Incumbent's commission expired April 8, 1934.

#### GEORGIA

Thomas V. Nevil to be postmaster at Claxton, Ga., in place of J. B. Brewton, removed.

James H. Hart to be postmaster at Ellaville, Ga., in place of McC. C. Gettys. Incumbent's commission expired May 23, 1933.

John E. Phinazee to be postmaster at Forsyth, Ga., in place of J. H. McCowen, removed.

Olin W. Patterson to be postmaster at Lumpkin, Ga., in place of A. C. Williams. Incumbent's commission expired December 20, 1932.

George W. Griffith to be postmaster at Manchester, Ga., in place of J. M. Guy. Incumbent's commission expired September 30, 1933.

Mary E. Everett to be postmaster at St. Simons Island, Ga., in place of M. E. Everett. Incumbent's commission expired April 8, 1934.

Ferman F. Chapman to be postmaster at Summerville, Ga., in place of R. N. Trimble. Incumbent's commission expired March 22, 1934.

Jennie I. Ingram to be postmaster at Townsend, Ga., in place of J. I. Ingram. Incumbent's commission expired April 8, 1934.

#### IDAHO

Fred L. Cruikshank to be postmaster at Montpelier, Idaho, in place of F. M. Winters, removed.

Ambrose H. McGuire to be postmaster at Pocatello, Idaho, in place of A. B. Bean, deceased.

Charles H. Hoag to be postmaster at Worley, Idaho, in place of C. H. Hoag. Incumbent's commission expired March 22, 1934.

#### ILLINOIS

Joseph S. Speelman to be postmaster at Arcola, Ill., in place of A. T. McLane. Incumbent's commission expired January 28, 1934.

Louise Rump to be postmaster at Beecher, Ill., in place of J. H. Wehrley. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1933.

John W. Williams to be postmaster at Benton, Ill., in place of C. E. Seeber, removed.

Luella C. Biggs to be postmaster at Blandinsville, Ill., in place of L. A. Roberts, removed.

Elbert McDonald to be postmaster at Carriers Mills, Ill., in place of Alice Jenkins, removed.

John P. Beckman to be postmaster at Carthage, Ill., in place of R. D. Denton, removed.

Harvey F. Doerge to be postmaster at Chester, Ill., in place of H. E. Burns, resigned.

Walter T. McCanna to be postmaster at Chillicothe, Ill., in place of T. R. Pearce, deceased.

Dwight C. Bacon to be postmaster at Christopher, Ill., in place of W. O. Baker, resigned.

John R. Reynolds to be postmaster at Colchester, Ill., in place of J. N. Bayless. Incumbent's commission expired January 19, 1933.

Andrew J. Paul to be postmaster at Dupou, Ill., in place of H. W. Schwartz, resigned.

George R. Gampher to be postmaster at Eldorado, Ill., in place of W. T. Warford. Incumbent's commission expired February 5, 1933.

Joseph Kreeger to be postmaster at Elgin, Ill., in place of B. W. Landberg. Incumbent's commission expired May 17, 1932.

Edmund J. Coveny to be postmaster at Elizabeth, Ill., in place of W. L. McKenzie, removed.

Ida B. Coyle to be postmaster at Equality, Ill., in place of R. R. Davis, removed.

James A. Cragan to be postmaster at Evansville, Ill., in place of J. H. Stolle. Incumbent's commission expired December 20, 1932.

George H. Fruit to be postmaster at Franklin Grove, Ill., in place of G. L. Spangler, removed.

Francis R. Shannon to be postmaster at Franklin Park, Ill., in place of Mary Slocum, removed.

John A. Gill to be postmaster at Galatia, Ill., in place of W. W. Ramsey, removed.

Elmer R. Randolph to be postmaster at Golconda, Ill., in place of Frances Baker, resigned.

William I. Tyler to be postmaster at Granville, Ill., in place of J. S. Redshaw, resigned.

Charles L. Jennings to be postmaster at Grayville, Ill., in place of E. J. Briswalter, Jr. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1933.

Arthur M. Hetherington to be postmaster at Harrisburg, Ill., in place of Harker Miley, resigned.

Arthur H. Bartlett to be postmaster at Hillsboro, Ill., in place of S. T. Little, removed.

Oliver P. Dickson to be postmaster at Homer, Ill., in place of B. C. Krugh. Incumbent's commission expired February 6, 1934.

Robert J. Wilson to be postmaster at Kewanee, Ill., in place of J. T. Johnson. Incumbent's commission expired December 20, 1932.

Fred O. Grissom to be postmaster at Kinmundy, Ill., in place of G. H. Bargh, removed.

Charles W. Farley to be postmaster at La Grange, Ill., in place of F. H. Stevens. Incumbent's commission expired December 12, 1926.

Henry C. Johnson to be postmaster at Lawrenceville, Ill., in place of A. C. Stoltz, removed.

Charles E. Gillespie to be postmaster at Louisville, Ill., in place of P. W. Gibson, removed.

George K. Brenner to be postmaster at Madison, Ill., in place of C. N. Smith. Incumbent's commission expired January 27, 1932.

James Carson to be postmaster at Mahomet, Ill., in place of I. L. Ford. Incumbent's commission expired May 12, 1932.

Ruth A. Tilford to be postmaster at Mansfield, Ill., in place of Nellie Mitchel, removed.

Hazel E. Davis to be postmaster at Minier, Ill., in place of Katherine Dickson. Incumbent's commission expired December 16, 1931.

Jesse C. Moore to be postmaster at Morton, Ill., in place of H. W. Mathis. Incumbent's commission expired December 20, 1932.

Lawrence E. Hodges to be postmaster at Mount Prospect, Ill., in place of A. C. Beigel. Incumbent's commission expired February 28, 1933.

William Raymond Grigg to be postmaster at Mount Vernon, Ill., in place of R. M. Farthing, removed.

Henry B. Shroyer to be postmaster at New Windsor, Ill., in place of H. C. Smith. Incumbent's commission expired December 20, 1932.

Warren S. Smith to be postmaster at Norris City, Ill., in place of E. E. Gott, removed.

William P. Carlton to be postmaster at Oblong, Ill., in place of R. M. Dalrymple, resigned.

Grace Hiller to be postmaster at Ogden, Ill., in place of William Hayes. Incumbent's commission expired January 21, 1933.

John J. Hart to be postmaster at Ottawa, Ill., in place of F. A. Sapp, removed.

William A. Mills to be postmaster at Salem, Ill., in place of A. E. Miller. Incumbent's position expired January 16, 1934.

George C. Miller to be postmaster at Sullivan, Ill., in place of C. E. McPheeters, removed.

Earl B. Strickland to be postmaster at Tolono, Ill., in place of J. E. Meharry. Incumbent's commission expired February 5, 1933.

Oliver M. Colwell to be postmaster at Toulon, Ill., in place of A. W. Shinn. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1933.

## INDIANA

Joseph A. McCormick to be postmaster at Ambia, Ind., in place of E. B. Smith. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1933.

J. Russell Byrd to be postmaster at Bloomfield, Ind., in place of C. E. Combs, removed.

Joseph J. Hartman to be postmaster at Earl Park, Ind., in place of C. H. Ruple. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1933.

James E. Freeman to be postmaster at Ellettsville, Ind., in place of M. E. Mitchell, deceased.

John C. Crosby to be postmaster as Huntington, Ind., in place of W. W. Lucas. Incumbent's commission expired December 13, 1932.

Ivan Conder to be postmaster at Jasonville, Ind., in place of C. W. Wood, deceased.

Ira J. Dye to be postmaster at Kouts, Ind., in place of Albert Honehouse. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1933.

Jacob W. Sappenfield to be postmaster at Lyons, Ind., in place of F. H. Maddox. Incumbent's commission expired January 19, 1933.

Arthur J. Green to be postmaster at Marion, Ind., in place of J. A. Jones, resigned.

Frank Chastain to be postmaster at Mitchell, Ind., in place of S. M. Isom, resigned.

L. Edgar Feagans to be postmaster at Montgomery, Ind., in place of J. W. Rudolph, removed.

Hugh G. McMahan to be postmaster at Rochester, Ind., in place of H. W. Dubois, removed.

Walter S. Kensler to be postmaster at Vincennes, Ind., in place of W. M. Willmore. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1932.

Mamie N. Judy to be postmaster at West Lebanon, Ind., in place of R. C. Wood. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1933.

## IOWA

Ruth F. Hollingshead to be postmaster at Albia, Iowa, in place of W. G. Wood, removed.

Zoe P. Way to be postmaster at Bussey, Iowa, in place of M. O. Jones. Incumbent's commission expired February 28, 1933.

Hollis S. Saar to be postmaster at Cantril, Iowa, in place of Gladys Miller. Incumbent's commission expired September 30, 1933.

Mark R. Doud to be postmaster at Douds, Iowa, in place of E. T. Greenfield. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1933.

Benjamin J. Stong to be postmaster at Keosauqua, Iowa, in place of J. O. Parker. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1933.

Floyd Stotts to be postmaster at Melcher, Iowa, in place of J. P. McNeill. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1933.

Russell G. Mellinger to be postmaster at Oakville, Iowa, in place of G. W. Graham. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1933.

Tomie L. Smith to be postmaster at Pleasantville, Iowa, in place of W. G. Stephenson. Incumbent's commission expired October 10, 1933.

James B. McLaughlin to be postmaster at Preston, Iowa, in place of Edward Oldis, removed.

Mary L. Tyner to be postmaster at Salem, Iowa, in place of W. W. Simkin. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1933.

Mary E. Kohorst to be postmaster at Templeton, Iowa, in place of W. H. Stevens. Incumbent's commission expired December 13, 1932.

## KANSAS

Hugo A. Simonton to be postmaster at Alta Vista, Kans., in place of H. A. Cory. Incumbent's commission expired January 8, 1933.

Zenobia A. Kissinger to be postmaster at Bennington, Kans., in place of Minnie Temple, removed.

James W. O'Connor to be postmaster at Chapman, Kans., in place of E. F. Halbert. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1932.

Carl G. Eddy to be postmaster at Colby, Kans., in place of H. L. Fryback, removed.

William H. Danenbarger to be postmaster at Concordia, Kans., in place of S. H. Knapp, removed.

John F. Holshouser to be postmaster at Dwight, Kans., in place of Edna Gordon. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1933.

Fred Sessin to be postmaster at Ellis, Kans., in place of G. H. Leisenring. Incumbent's commission expired January 8, 1933.

Joseph B. Basgall to be postmaster at Hays, Kans., in place of H. W. Chittenden. Incumbent's commission expired December 16, 1933.

Stephen E. Murray to be postmaster at Jamestown, Kans., in place of W. A. Carlile, resigned.

Jack W. Boyle to be postmaster at McDonald, Kans., in place of H. L. Caswell. Incumbent's commission expired December 16, 1933.

Mary M. Browne to be postmaster at Norton, Kans., in place of H. L. Stevens, removed.

Noah D. Zeigler to be postmaster at Oakley, Kans., in place of Myron Johnson, removed.

Elton L. Pounds to be postmaster at Smith Center, Kans., in place of W. R. Lathrop, removed.

Jacob K. Luder to be postmaster at Waldo, Kans., in place of J. K. Luder. Incumbent's commission expired March 8, 1934.

Paul L. Turgeon to be postmaster at Wilson, Kans., in place of Edward Buehler, removed.

#### KENTUCKY

William E. Ferguson to be postmaster at Albany, Ky., in place of J. W. Felkins, removed.

Walter B. Carvell to be postmaster at Allensville, Ky., in place of A. M. Coleman, resigned.

Nora Dixon McGee to be postmaster at Burkesville, Ky., in place of L. W. Thrasher, resigned.

Susan R. Hill to be postmaster at Carrollton, Ky., in place of M. K. Kipping. Incumbent's commission expired February 17, 1931.

Nathaniel M. Elliott to be postmaster at Corbin, Ky., in place of Belle Gray. Incumbent's commission expired January 28, 1934.

George W. Mothershead to be postmaster at Earlington, Ky., in place of J. S. Webb, resigned.

Osceola C. Lucas to be postmaster at Florence, Ky., in place of M. V. Tanner. Incumbent's commission expired September 18, 1933.

Richard L. Frymire to be postmaster at Irvington, Ky., in place of N. J. Wathen, removed.

Mary H. Vaughan to be postmaster at Jenkins, Ky., in place of W. H. Sergent, resigned.

Joseph C. Pell to be postmaster at Lewisport, Ky., in place of B. H. Lott, removed.

Grace Williams to be postmaster at Lothair, Ky., in place of C. A. Dixon. Incumbent's commission expired June 11, 1933.

James T. Phipps to be postmaster at Morganfield, Ky., in place of R. L. Jones, removed.

James M. Caudill to be postmaster at Neon, Ky., in place of J. E. Skaggs. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1933.

William A. Eimer to be postmaster at Newport, Ky., in place of J. H. Meyer. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1933.

George Pinson, Jr., to be postmaster at Pikeville, Ky., in place of F. R. Hamilton, resigned.

Mason E. Burton to be postmaster at Somerset, Ky., in place of C. L. Tartar, removed.

John B. Lafferty to be postmaster at Wheelwright, Ky., in place of J. B. Lafferty. Incumbent's commission expired December 11, 1933.

Watson G. Holbrook to be postmaster at Whitesburg, Ky., in place of R. F. Adams. Incumbent's commission expired February 28, 1933.

#### LOUISIANA

Theo Lemoine to be postmaster at Cottonport, La., in place of J. D. Hebert. Incumbent's commission expired February 1, 1934.

Marvin A. Kent to be postmaster at De Quincy, La., in place of W. T. Kent, resigned.

Charles I. Davis to be postmaster at Leesville, La., in place of B. F. Cowley, removed.

William E. Brock to be postmaster at Natchitoches, La., in place of J. A. Gannon, removed.

Leon S. Haas to be postmaster at Opelousas, La., in place of B. B. Franques, resigned.

Thelma L. Ellis to be postmaster at Sulphur, La., in place of E. A. Toniette, removed.

#### MAINE

Richard F. Hughes to be postmaster at Brownville Junction, Maine, in place of G. A. Berry. Incumbent's commission expired January 16, 1934.

Erma G. Maxim to be postmaster at Corinna, Maine, in place of D. W. Sprague. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1933.

Jerome G. Russell to be postmaster at Danforth, Maine, in place of E. J. Gilpatrick. Incumbent's commission expired December 11, 1933.

Leon C. Weed to be postmaster at Deer Isle, Maine, in place of J. E. Lufkin. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1933.

Elsie D. Smart to be postmaster at Eagle Lake, Maine, in place of Flavie Fournier. Incumbent's commission expired January 16, 1934.

John A. Lyons to be postmaster at East Millinocket, Maine, in place of W. A. Stratton. Incumbent's commission expired January 8, 1934.

Norman R. Thombs to be postmaster at Greenville, Maine, in place of M. B. Folsom. Incumbent's commission expired January 31, 1934.

Cyril Cyr to be postmaster at Jackman Station, Maine, in place of E. M. Moore. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1933.

Edna G. Chase to be postmaster at Limestone, Maine, in place of E. G. Chase. Incumbent's commission expired January 16, 1934.

William E. Baker to be postmaster at Lubec, Maine, in place of J. M. Pike. Incumbent's commission expired May 16, 1932.

Sumner A. Fickett to be postmaster at Millbridge, Maine, in place of J. S. Stevens. Incumbent's commission expired December 7, 1932.

May C. Thorpe to be postmaster at Sabattus, Maine, in place of T. H. Phelan. Incumbent's commission expired April 28, 1934.

Earl W. Gott to be postmaster at South West Harbor, Maine, in place of E. S. Thurston. Incumbent's commission expired January 31, 1934.

Lewis P. Philbrick to be postmaster at Thorndike, Maine, in place of E. L. Bartlett. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1933.

Orrin V. Drew to be postmaster at Vinalhaven, Maine, in place of F. L. Roberts. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1933.

Ernest F. Poulin to be postmaster at Waterville, Maine, in place of E. J. Brown, removed.

#### MARYLAND

Jacob R. L. Wink to be postmaster at Manchester, Md., in place of H. N. Burgoon. Incumbent's commission expired February 28, 1933.

Francis H. Blake to be postmaster at Sparks, Md., in place of S. G. Sparks, deceased.

Joseph Wilmer Baker to be postmaster at Union Bridge, Md., in place of G. C. Eichelberger. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1933.

Nellie T. Reed to be postmaster at Williamsport, Md., in place of L. B. Miller. Incumbent's commission expired January 19, 1933.

#### MASSACHUSETTS

George F. Cramer to be postmaster at Amherst, Mass., in place of F. A. Shepard, resigned.

Henry J. Cottrell to be postmaster at Beverly, Mass., in place of J. E. Herrick, deceased.

Frances A. Rogers to be postmaster at Billerica, Mass., in place of T. F. Lyons, deceased.

Arthur A. Hendrick to be postmaster at Brockton, Mass., in place of W. B. Littlefield, retired.

Francis K. Irwin to be postmaster at Cataumet, Mass., in place of F. K. Irwin. Incumbent's commission expired December 8, 1932.

Thomas V. Sweeney to be postmaster at Harding, Mass., in place of E. L. Downing. Incumbent's commission expired January 29, 1933.

Josephine R. McLaughlin to be postmaster at Hathorne, Mass., in place of D. M. Kelley. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1934.

George M. Lynch to be postmaster at Somerset, Mass., in place of F. B. Hood. Incumbent's commission expired December 16, 1933.

Thaddeus F. Webber to be postmaster at Winchendon, Mass., in place of W. H. Pierce, resigned.

## MICHIGAN

Daniel M. McAuliffe to be postmaster at Albion, Mich., in place of E. J. Mallory, deceased.

Roscoe B. Huston to be postmaster at Detroit, Mich., in place of C. C. Kellogg, deceased.

Ernest G. Corbin to be postmaster at Hart, Mich., in place of W. E. Lewis. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1933.

John R. O'Meara to be postmaster at Hillsdale, Mich., in place of E. F. Lyon. Incumbent's commission expired May 18, 1932.

Robert F. Allan to be postmaster at Holly, Mich., in place of H. D. Cole. Incumbent's commission expired February 28, 1933.

James C. Healy to be postmaster at Houghton, Mich., in place of Edgar Rashleigh. Incumbent's commission expired January 15, 1933.

George A. Curry to be postmaster at Ironwood, Mich., in place of C. J. Larson, retired.

Alfred J. Rochon to be postmaster at Marine City, Mich., in place of G. N. Jones, resigned.

John C. Bannow to be postmaster at Mount Clemens, Mich., in place of W. C. Hacker, resigned.

George W. McCabe to be postmaster at Petoskey, Mich., in place of C. J. Gray, resigned.

Oliver C. Boynton, Jr., to be postmaster at St. Ignace, Mich., in place of E. F. Seward. Incumbent's commission expired January 26, 1933.

Lydia A. McElhinney to be postmaster at Snover, Mich., in place of L. A. McElhinney. Incumbent's commission expired March 18, 1934.

## MINNESOTA

Joseph A. Heimer to be postmaster at Adams, Minn., in place of B. J. Huseby. Incumbent's commission expired May 28, 1933.

Bert C. Hazle to be postmaster at Alden, Minn., in place of H. A. Beach. Incumbent's commission expired January 29, 1933.

William L. Ward to be postmaster at Anoka, Minn., in place of G. H. Veidt. Incumbent's commission expired March 22, 1928.

Charles B. Frazer to be postmaster at Battle Lake, Minn., in place of G. H. Hopkins. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1933.

Alexander Kolhei to be postmaster at Cottonwood, Minn., in place of E. A. Schilling. Incumbent's commission expired December 20, 1932.

Glen J. Merritt to be postmaster at Duluth, Minn., in place of Thomas Considine. Incumbent's commission expired May 8, 1932.

Norman M. Brown to be postmaster at Ely, Minn., in place of Frank Schweiger. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1933.

Gilbert P. Finnegan to be postmaster at Eveleth, Minn., in place of D. P. McIntyre. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1932.

Mark R. Gorman to be postmaster at Fairmont, Minn., in place of E. J. Merry, transferred.

Bernard A. Gorman to be postmaster at Goodhue, Minn., in place of M. S. Kindseth. Incumbent's commission expired June 7, 1933.

James F. Fahey to be postmaster at Graceville, Minn., in place of R. C. O'Neill. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1933.

Dagny G. Sundahl to be postmaster at Grove City, Minn., in place of W. D. Hanson. Incumbent's commission expired February 28, 1933.

Earl Stanton to be postmaster at Hayfield, Minn., in place of H. U. Boe, resigned.

Leo L. Champlin to be postmaster at Mankato, Minn., in place of H. M. Hauck, resigned.

William C. Robertson to be postmaster at Minneapolis, Minn., in place of A. J. Schunk. Incumbent's commission expired November 20, 1933.

Andrew Reid to be postmaster at South St. Paul, Minn., in place of J. N. Irving. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1933.

Andrew Anderson to be postmaster at Thief River Falls, Minn., in place of T. P. Anderson. Incumbent's commission expired November 20, 1933.

## MISSISSIPPI

Frances G. Wimberly to be postmaster at Jonestown, Miss., in place of F. G. Wimberly. Incumbent's commission expired December 16, 1933.

Mamie L. Harvey to be postmaster at Mathiston, Miss., in place of Maude Barton. Incumbent's commission expired May 23, 1933.

John R. Oliver to be postmaster at Natchez, Miss., in place of E. N. Hale, resigned.

William C. Mabry to be postmaster at Newton, Miss., in place of A. D. McLelland. Incumbent's commission expired January 15, 1933.

Robert A. Dean to be postmaster at Okolona, Miss., in place of W. L. Jansen. Incumbent's commission expired May 23, 1932.

Henry Boswell to be postmaster at Sanatorium, Miss., in place of Henry Boswell. Incumbent's commission expired March 8, 1934.

James C. Lamkin to be postmaster at Yazoo City, Miss., in place of S. W. Mott. Incumbent's commission expired February 23, 1930.

## MISSOURI

Harold Stewart to be postmaster at Bolivar, Mo., in place of D. W. Puthuff, removed.

Joseph W. McMenus to be postmaster at Conway, Mo., in place of I. E. Knight. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1933.

James F. Hughes to be postmaster at Greenville, Mo., in place of R. R. White. Incumbent's commission expired March 8, 1934.

Alexander W. Graham to be postmaster at Kansas City, Mo., in place of W. E. Morton. Incumbent's commission expired January 19, 1933.

Hugh M. Price to be postmaster at La Monte, Mo., in place of J. B. Marshall. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1933.

Elisha O. Bryeans to be postmaster at Oran, Mo., in place of A. L. Brady. Incumbent's commission expired December 20, 1932.

Orlo H. Bond to be postmaster at Sheridan, Mo., in place of O. M. Churchill. Incumbent's commission expired June 19, 1933.

Leah M. White to be postmaster at Smithton, Mo., in place of W. H. Reynolds. Incumbent's commission expired February 1, 1933.

Emmett R. Burrows to be postmaster at Van Buren, Mo., in place of R. E. Dusenbery. Incumbent's commission expired February 1, 1933.

## MONTANA

Ray M. Birck to be postmaster at Corvallis, Mont., in place of T. L. Morris, removed.

Robert Midtlyng to be postmaster at Deer Lodge, Mont., in place of Thomas Hirst. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1933.

Harry J. Andrus to be postmaster at Dillon, Mont., in place of J. C. Faller. Incumbent's commission expired December 12, 1928.

Harry C. Hendricks to be postmaster at Helena, Mont., in place of K. G. Hoon. Incumbent's commission expired January 31, 1934.

Leaone K. C. Roderick to be postmaster at Outlook, Mont., in place of L. K. C. Roderick. Incumbent's commission expired March 18, 1934.

John R. Kruger to be postmaster at Plains, Mont., in place of H. L. Coulter. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1933.

George T. Farrell to be postmaster at Polson, Mont., in place of C. J. Sonstelié. Incumbent's commission expired April 17, 1932.

William A. Francis to be postmaster at Virginia City, Mont., in place of W. A. Francis. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1933.

Lonnie T. Dennis to be postmaster at Whitefish, Mont., in place of E. M. Hutchinson. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1933.

Ray E. Willey to be postmaster at Wisdom, Mont., in place of R. E. Willey. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1933.

## NEBRASKA

Fred C. Buhk to be postmaster at Beemer, Nebr., in place of Ruth Harrison. Incumbent's commission expired June 8, 1933.

Max C. Jensen to be postmaster at Bridgeport, Nebr., in place of W. H. Willis, removed.

Edgar R. Johnson to be postmaster at Butte, Nebr., in place of J. N. Fuller, resigned.

Henry F. Maika to be postmaster at Chadron, Nebr., in place of O. J. Schwiéger, removed.

Henry G. Andersen to be postmaster at Cozad, Nebr., in place of D. F. Stevens, Sr., removed.

Martha E. McDonald to be postmaster at Craig, Nebr., in place of C. E. Cram. Incumbent's commission expired December 16, 1933.

Loyd H. Metzger to be postmaster at Culbertson, Nebr., in place of J. G. Crews, resigned.

George W. Nicholas, Jr., to be postmaster at De Witt, Nebr., in place of G. W. Nicholas. Incumbent's commission expired May 23, 1932.

Arthur Scism to be postmaster at Edgar, Nebr., in place of H. E. Welch, deceased.

Lyle P. Dierks to be postmaster at Ewing, Nebr., in place of Garry Benson. Incumbent's commission expired December 16, 1933.

Oscar C. Thomas to be postmaster at Franklin, Nebr., in place of C. E. Cook, resigned.

Isaac R. L. Taylor to be postmaster at Gibbon, Nebr., in place of C. E. Johnson, removed.

Clifford R. Frasier to be postmaster at Gothenburg, Nebr., in place of W. I. Stebbins. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1933.

Clyde Yardley to be postmaster at Hemingford, Nebr., in place of Georgia Muirhead. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1932.

Charles Hynek to be postmaster at Humboldt, Nebr., in place of E. W. Clift, deceased.

Helen M. Fowler to be postmaster at Leigh, Nebr., in place of H. C. Hooker. Incumbent's commission expired December 16, 1933.

Andres P. Peterson to be postmaster at Lindsay, Nebr., in place of A. P. Peterson. Incumbent's commission expired April 3, 1934.

Russell B. Somerville to be postmaster at McCook, Nebr., in place of H. H. Woolard, transferred.

Mabel E. Sughrue to be postmaster at McCool Junction, Nebr., in place of T. E. Williams. Incumbent's commission expired January 26, 1933.

Eva G. Quick to be postmaster at Morrill, Nebr., in place of R. G. Walsh, removed.

Harold A. Langford to be postmaster at North Platte, Nebr., in place of W. A. Barraclough, removed.

Adolf E. Kaspar to be postmaster at Prague, Nebr., in place of Cyril Svoboda. Incumbent's commission expired February 12, 1933.

Bessie L. Baughan to be postmaster at Stamford, Nebr., in place of C. E. Lewis. Incumbent's commission expired December 16, 1933.

Gail Lidgard to be postmaster at Stockville, Nebr., in place of L. C. Brown. Incumbent's commission expired January 9, 1933.

Arthur B. Yates to be postmaster at Sutherland, Nebr., in place of M. E. Hossack, deceased.

Hester E. Lowe to be postmaster at Wolbach, Nebr., in place of E. A. Wight, Jr. Incumbent's commission expired December 16, 1933.

David D. O'Kane to be postmaster at Wood River, Nebr., in place of F. J. Riesland. Incumbent's commission expired January 9, 1933.

## NEW HAMPSHIRE

Clarence A. Burt to be postmaster at Concord, N.H., in place of W. R. Heath, deceased.

Benjamin H. Dodge to be postmaster at New Boston, N.H., in place of B. H. Dodge. Incumbent's commission expired April 15, 1934.

Robert E. Gould to be postmaster at Newport, N.H., in place of S. C. Newell. Incumbent's commission expired February 28, 1933.

H. Leslie Thompson to be postmaster at North Haverhill, N.H., in place of C. F. Southard, deceased.

Richard U. Cogswell to be postmaster at Warner, N.H., in place of A. S. Cloues. Incumbent's commission expired December 16, 1933.

## NEW JERSEY

Ernest F. Rohn to be postmaster at Arlington, N.J., in place of R. E. Torrance. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1932.

Richard P. Hughes to be postmaster at Burlington, N.J., in place of J. A. Lowden. Incumbent's commission expired September 30, 1933.

Jacob Garrison to be postmaster at Cape May Court House, N.J., in place of H. E. Richardson, removed.

Nelson Pickel to be postmaster at Clinton, N.J., in place of J. D. Hall, removed.

Philip L. Fellingier to be postmaster at East Orange, N.J., in place of L. A. Streit, removed.

Joseph A. Aloia to be postmaster at Garfield, N.J., in place of DeW. L. Anderson. Incumbent's commission expired May 28, 1933.

John F. Dugan to be postmaster at Garwood, N.J., in place of Richard Watt, deceased.

Louis C. Parker to be postmaster at Gloucester City, N.J., in place of A. C. Powell, deceased.

Bertha S. Irving to be postmaster at Haddonfield, N.J., in place of A. F. Wayne. Incumbent's commission expired December 13, 1932.

Thomas F. Curtis to be postmaster at Lakehurst, N.J., in place of Harold Pittis. Incumbent's commission expired February 28, 1932.

James A. Cleary to be postmaster at Lambertville, N.J., in place of C. D. McCracken. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1933.

Patrick J. Whelan to be postmaster at Manville, N.J., in place of Lester Quigley. Incumbent's commission expired February 12, 1933.

William D. Hayes to be postmaster at Millburn, N.J., in place of D. D. Dolbeer, removed.

Thomas L. Bell to be postmaster at Montclair, N.J., in place of E. G. Chamberlin, deceased.

George M. Gibson to be postmaster at Moorestown, N.J., in place of E. F. Benners. Incumbent's commission expired February 12, 1933.

John J. Quinn to be postmaster at Perth Amboy, N.J., in place of F. P. Hansen. Incumbent's commission expired June 19, 1933.

Kathryn B. Donohue to be postmaster at Saddle River, N.J., in place of J. G. DeBann. Incumbent's commission expired October 10, 1933.

Joseph S. Devlin to be postmaster at Sea Girt, N.J., in place of F. L. Newman. Incumbent's commission expired February 28, 1933.

John J. O'Hanlon to be postmaster at South Orange, N.J., in place of N. A. Chasse. Incumbent's commission expired February 12, 1933.

Edward J. Jennings to be postmaster at Trenton, N.J., in place of C. H. Updike, resigned.

James J. Dunne to be postmaster at Woodbridge, N.J., in place of S. C. Potter. Incumbent's commission expired December 13, 1932.

## NEW YORK

William S. Brown to be postmaster at Antwerp, N.Y., in place of H. D. Fuller, removed.

Helen M. Freese to be postmaster at Massapequa, N.Y., in place of M. R. Post, resigned.

Douglas Rockett to be postmaster at Mohegan Lake, N.Y., in place of W. V. Horne, removed.

Charles I. Lavery to be postmaster at Poughkeepsie, N.Y., in place of E. J. Conklin. Incumbent's commission expired February 6, 1934.

William J. Griffin, Jr., to be postmaster at Starlake, N.Y., in place of Fred Tears, removed.

Phillip J. Smith to be postmaster at Webster, N.Y., in place of H. L. Philips. Incumbent's commission expired December 16, 1933.

## NORTH CAROLINA

Berta B. White to be postmaster at Ellerbe, N.C., in place of Walter Hogan. Incumbent's commission expired February 14, 1934.

Jennings M. Koontz to be postmaster at Kannapolis, N.C., in place of E. E. Lady. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1933.

George W. Hardison to be postmaster at Plymouth, N.C., in place of A. L. Alexander, removed.

Basil D. Barr to be postmaster at West Jefferson, N.C., in place of F. B. Jones. Incumbent's commission expired February 10, 1934.

## NORTH DAKOTA

Karl E. Fischer to be postmaster at Hague, N.Dak., in place of K. E. Fischer. Incumbent's commission expired December 20, 1932.

Bennie M. Burreson to be postmaster at Pekin, N.Dak., in place of B. M. Burreson. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1933.

## OHIO

Walter E. Cole to be postmaster at Andover, Ohio, in place of E. H. Phelps, removed.

Mary E. Bakle to be postmaster at Antwerp, Ohio, in place of L. B. Masters. Incumbent's commission expired December 16, 1933.

William J. Grandy to be postmaster at Byesville, Ohio, in place of Carl Ledman, removed.

Harry H. Weiss to be postmaster at Canton, Ohio, in place of L. T. Cool, retired.

Frank G. Schalmo to be postmaster at Canal Fulton, Ohio, in place of W. H. Fellmeth. Incumbent's commission expired December 8, 1932.

Leita Tuttle to be postmaster at Chardon, Ohio, in place of S. N. Austin. Incumbent's commission expired December 16, 1933.

Thomas G. Moore to be postmaster at East Orwell, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1933.

Myrtle Grant to be postmaster at Grove City, Ohio, in place of Orin Breckenridge, resigned.

Harlan B. Merkle to be postmaster at Hartville, Ohio, in place of O. R. Wiley. Incumbent's commission expired December 16, 1933.

Thomas Kyer to be postmaster at Jackson, Ohio, in place of J. L. Bales. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1931.

Daniel L. Pokey to be postmaster at Lakeside, Ohio, in place of G. H. Meek. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1933.

Clelland R. Polen to be postmaster at Lewisville, Ohio, in place of F. S. Neuhardt. Incumbent's commission expired December 7, 1932.

Benjamin E. Bowden to be postmaster at Lowell, Ohio, in place of D. B. Stanley, retired.

Anna M. Cook to be postmaster at Lucasville, Ohio, in place of C. W. Appel. Incumbent's commission expired December 16, 1933.

Harry W. Gordon to be postmaster at McConnelsville, Ohio, in place of R. M. Fouts. Incumbent's commission expired March 18, 1934.

Howard D. DeMar to be postmaster at Madeira, Ohio, in place of G. C. Bauer. Incumbent's commission expired December 7, 1932.

Everett Bennett to be postmaster at Morrow, Ohio, in place of Clem Couden, deceased.

Fred A. Stratton to be postmaster at Mount Orab, Ohio, in place of E. E. Ely. Incumbent's commission expired December 16, 1933.

Palmer Phillips to be postmaster at Mount Sterling, Ohio, in place of W. A. Ray, deceased.

Garrett W. Bowen to be postmaster at Newtown, Ohio, in place of A. A. Sticksel. Incumbent's commission expired December 8, 1932.

Lester Overfield to be postmaster at North Lewisburg, Ohio, in place of E. L. D. Tritt. Incumbent's commission expired December 16, 1933.

John O. Entrikin to be postmaster at North Lima, Ohio, in place of H. S. Sell. Incumbent's commission expired December 16, 1933.

Michael J. Gumbriell to be postmaster at North Olmsted, Ohio, in place of E. F. Kelley. Incumbent's commission expired December 13, 1932.

Charles O. Frederick to be postmaster at Norwalk, Ohio, in place of A. W. Davis. Incumbent's commission expired March 22, 1934.

Carl S. Corvin to be postmaster at Oak Hill, Ohio, in place of R. S. Williams. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1931.

Agnes O. Schritz to be postmaster at Olmsted Falls, Ohio, in place of W. B. Maynard. Incumbent's commission expired December 13, 1932.

Wilver T. Naragon to be postmaster at Osborn, Ohio, in place of I. R. Kneisly. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1932.

James M. McCrone to be postmaster at Poland, Ohio, in place of Lucina Byers. Incumbent's commission expired December 16, 1933.

Thomas F. Short to be postmaster at Seaman, Ohio, in place of L. R. Williamson. Incumbent's commission expired December 16, 1933.

Dorothy M. Lane to be postmaster at Stockport, Ohio, in place of J. A. Hayes. Incumbent's commission expired April 16, 1934.

Homer H. Dearth to be postmaster at Summerfield, Ohio, in place of N. S. Hall, resigned.

Urn S. Abbott to be postmaster at Tiffin, Ohio, in place of J. P. Locke. Incumbent's commission expired January 31, 1934.

Frank H. Waldeck to be postmaster at Warren, Ohio, in place of F. S. Van Gorder. Incumbent's commission expired March 22, 1934.

Harry A. Higgins to be postmaster at Xenia, Ohio, in place of C. S. Frazer. Incumbent's commission expired January 9, 1933.

## OKLAHOMA

Martin G. Kizer to be postmaster at Apache, Okla., in place of J. K. Miller, removed.

Albert A. Johnson to be postmaster at Bartlesville, Okla., in place of John Johnstone. Incumbent's commission expired January 20, 1934.

Cloyd H. Burton to be postmaster at Commerce, Okla., in place of Edward Pennington, removed.

Glenn D. Burns to be postmaster at Dover, Okla., in place of L. R. Gray, removed.

Georgie M. Jeffers to be postmaster at Inola, Okla., in place of M. A. Eaton, resigned.

Vesta Denham to be postmaster at Three Sands, Okla., in place of A. L. Snyder. Incumbent's commission expired March 22, 1934.

Thomas O. Stewart to be postmaster at Wapanucka, Okla., in place of B. A. Wolverton, removed.

## OREGON

William J. McLean to be postmaster at Kerby, Oreg. Office became Presidential July 1, 1933.

Bryan Dieckman to be postmaster at Myrtle Creek, Oreg., in place of A. M. March. Incumbent's commission expired June 7, 1933.

## PENNSYLVANIA

Harry W. McArthur to be postmaster at Conneaut Lake Park, Pa., in place of G. W. Irvin. Incumbent's commission expired January 28, 1934.

Herbert S. Young to be postmaster at Easton, Pa., in place of E. P. Richards, resigned.

James W. Hatch to be postmaster at North Girard, Pa., in place of J. W. Hatch. Incumbent's commission expired April 16, 1934.

William M. Turner to be postmaster at Pittsburgh, Pa., in place of J. B. Anderson, retired.

## PUERTO RICO

Cesar Rossy to be postmaster at Ciales, P.R., in place of Cesar Rossy. Incumbent's commission expired April 3, 1934.

## SOUTH CAROLINA

William B. Smith to be postmaster at Greer, S.C., in place of S. T. Waldrop. Incumbent's commission expired February 10, 1934.

William T. Hemingway to be postmaster at Hemingway, S.C., in place of A. V. Thames. Incumbent's commission expired January 8, 1933.

Harriette H. McLaurin to be postmaster at McColl, S.C., in place of A. MacL. Fletcher. Incumbent's commission expired February 28, 1933.

William W. Barr, Jr., to be postmaster at Springfield, S.C., in place of H. J. Bailey, removed.

## SOUTH DAKOTA

James Gaynor to be postmaster at Springfield, S.Dak., in place of James Gaynor. Incumbent's commission expired March 22, 1934.

## TENNESSEE

Mabel W. Hughes to be postmaster at Arlington, Tenn., in place of M. W. Hughes. Incumbent's commission expired April 15, 1934.

Ernest F. Dennis to be postmaster at Chattanooga, Tenn., in place of W. J. Springfield, resigned.

Joseph M. Dedman to be postmaster at Columbia, Tenn., in place of A. R. Atkerson, resigned.

## TEXAS

Lee Brown to be postmaster at Blanco, Tex., in place of Lee Brown. Incumbent's commission expired April 15, 1934.

Joseph Y. Fraser to be postmaster at Colorado, Tex., in place of R. S. Brennand. Incumbent's commission expired April 15, 1934.

Opal Farris to be postmaster at Daisetta, Tex., in place of Opal Farris. Incumbent's commission expired April 15, 1934.

Joe C. Martin to be postmaster at Itasca, Tex., in place of Imogene Bacon. Incumbent's commission expired May 31, 1933.

Asbury R. Odom to be postmaster at Rusk, Tex., in place of D. B. Lawson. Incumbent's commission expired September 18, 1933.

William C. Wells to be postmaster at Tahoka, Tex., in place of D. A. Parkhurst, removed.

Mary E. Holtzclaw to be postmaster at Tatum, Tex., in place of M. E. Holtzclaw. Incumbent's commission expired April 15, 1934.

Mollie S. Berryman to be postmaster at Willis, Tex., in place of A. H. Russell. Incumbent's commission expired January 16, 1933.

## UTAH

Ewell C. Bowen to be postmaster at Hiawatha, Utah, in place of E. C. Bowen. Incumbent's commission expired January 31, 1934.

Jabez W. Dangerfield to be postmaster at Provo, Utah, in place of J. P. McGuire. Incumbent's commission expired March 8, 1934.

## VERMONT

Gertrude L. Cutler to be postmaster at Cambridge, Vt., in place of F. A. Spaulding, resigned.

Hollis S. Johnson to be postmaster at Castleton, Vt., in place of H. M. Brown. Incumbent's commission expired December 16, 1933.

Rutherford D. Pfenning to be postmaster at Forest Dale, Vt., in place of W. H. C. Whitcomb. Incumbent's commission expired December 20, 1932.

William T. Johnson to be postmaster at Hardwick, Vt., in place of A. C. Hooker, retired.

Mabel M. Hemenway to be postmaster at Jeffersonville, Vt., in place of R. B. Thomas. Incumbent's commission expired January 29, 1933.

Patrick J. Candon to be postmaster at Pittsford, Vt., in place of E. H. Willis, removed.

Wayland N. Hamel to be postmaster at Plainfield, Vt., in place of R. M. Cutting. Incumbent's commission expired December 16, 1933.

Mary F. Brown to be postmaster at Readsboro, Vt., in place of V. S. Thayer, resigned.

Mabel R. Armstrong to be postmaster at Rupert, Vt., in place of E. R. Sheldon, deceased.

James G. Boutelle to be postmaster at Townshend, Vt., in place of O. B. Dauchy. Incumbent's commission expired December 20, 1932.

Thomas R. Flynn to be postmaster at Underhill, Vt., in place of W. T. Mead, deceased.

Waldo K. Powers to be postmaster at Vergennes, Vt., in place of A. S. Haven. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1932.

Peter E. Kehoe to be postmaster at West Pawlet, Vt., in place of A. W. Burdick, resigned.

Martin H. Bowen to be postmaster at Wolcott, Vt., in place of K. A. Foster. Incumbent's commission expired December 20, 1932.

## VIRGINIA

Lewis C. Jamison to be postmaster at Boone Mill, Va., in place of Creighton Angell. Incumbent's commission expired January 16, 1934.

Thomas W. Cooke to be postmaster at Gloucester, Va., in place of J. G. Phillips. Incumbent's commission expired February 17, 1934.

Walter McC. Greer to be postmaster at Rockymount, Va., in place of R. L. Davis. Incumbent's commission expired May 26, 1932.

## WASHINGTON

Gustave A. Weber to be postmaster at Odessa, Wash., in place of G. A. Weber. Incumbent's commission expired March 18, 1934.

Blanche H. Barton to be postmaster at Othello, Wash., in place of J. E. McManamon, removed.

William H. Padley to be postmaster at Reardan, Wash., in place of W. H. Padley. Incumbent's commission expired April 2, 1934.

Andrew J. Diedrich to be postmaster at Valley, Wash., in place of A. J. Diedrich. Incumbent's commission expired April 2, 1934.

## WEST VIRGINIA

Charles A. Skaggs to be postmaster at Cedar Grove, W.Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1933.

Earl S. Miller to be postmaster at Mount Hope, W.Va., in place of T. A. Jones. Incumbent's commission expired February 13, 1933.

Harry Clarke to be postmaster at Owens, W.Va., in place of O. E. Layne. Incumbent's commission expired January 30, 1933.

Harry E. Riddleberger to be postmaster at St. Albans, W.Va., in place of U. S. Jarrett. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1933.

## WISCONSIN

Richard P. Kielty to be postmaster at Altoona, Wis., in place of L. I. Edgell. Incumbent's commission expired December 16, 1933.

Frank A. Buettner to be postmaster at Bowler, Wis., in place of Fred Hennig. Incumbent's commission expired February 28, 1933.

Berthea Overgood to be postmaster at Brantwood, Wis., in place of Elmer Carlson, removed.

William L. Lee to be postmaster at Drummond, Wis., in place of E. G. Carter. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1933.

Herman W. Paff to be postmaster at Elk Mound, Wis., in place of A. M. Howe. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1933.

John T. Tovey to be postmaster at Fremont, Wis., in place of G. F. Sherburne. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1933.

Max R. Alling to be postmaster at Green Lake, Wis., in place of M. L. Kutchin. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1933.

Frank Hepe to be postmaster at Kewaskum, Wis., in place of E. D. Koch. Incumbent's commission expired January 22, 1934.

John J. Steiner to be postmaster at Mauston, Wis., in place of J. H. McNown. Incumbent's commission expired January 21, 1933.

Albert E. Hansen to be postmaster at Mendota, Wis., in place of William Rathbun. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1933.

Nicholas Ablor to be postmaster at Mount Calvary, Wis., in place of George Henry. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1933.

Maurice E. Kennedy to be postmaster at New Lisbon, Wis., in place of C. C. Martin. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1933.

John V. Nickodem to be postmaster at Princeton, Wis., in place of L. L. Merrill. Incumbent's commission expired May 10, 1933.

Irwin J. Rieck to be postmaster at Weyauwega, Wis., in place of G. T. Classon. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1931.

Edwin F. Smith to be postmaster at Wisconsin Veterans' Home, Wis., in place of G. A. Murray. Incumbent's commission expired February 28, 1933.

## CONFIRMATIONS

*Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 18 (legislative day of Apr. 17), 1934*

## UNITED STATES MARSHAL

John B. Ponder to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Texas.

## APPOINTMENTS BY TRANSFER IN THE REGULAR ARMY

Capt. John Robin Davis Cleland to Adjutant General's Department.

First Lt. Charles Franklin Born to Air Corps.

## APPOINTMENT BY PROMOTION IN THE REGULAR ARMY

Walter King Wilson to be colonel, Coast Artillery Corps.  
Myron Sidney Crissy to be colonel, Coast Artillery Corps.  
Oscar Foley to be colonel, Cavalry.

Frederick Dudley Griffith, Jr., to be colonel, Cavalry.

Wallace Copeland Philoon to be lieutenant colonel, Infantry.

Charles Bartell Meyer to be lieutenant colonel, Coast Artillery Corps.

Herbert LeRoy Taylor to be lieutenant colonel, Infantry.

James Rowland Hill to be lieutenant colonel, Quartermaster Corps.

Creighton Kerr to be major, Coast Artillery Corps.

LeRoy Murray Edwards to be major, Finance Department.

John Arthur McDonald to be major, Quartermaster Corps.

Stephen Burdette Massey to be major, Quartermaster Corps.

Albert Jamerson Chappell to be major, Quartermaster Corps.

Morton Howard McKinnon to be captain, Air Corps.

Elmer Dane Pangburn to be captain, Infantry.

Nathan William Thomas to be captain, Quartermaster Corps.

Walter Bernard Hough to be captain, Air Corps.

William Michael Lanagan to be captain, Air Corps.

George Platt Tourtelot to be captain, Air Corps.

George Hendricks Beverley to be captain, Air Corps.

Walter Kellsey Burgess to be captain, Air Corps.

Paul California Wilkins to be captain, Air Corps.

Bruno William Brooks to be captain, Quartermaster Corps.

Thomas Joseph Brennan, Jr., to be first lieutenant, Cavalry.

Robert Loyal Easton to be first lieutenant, Air Corps.

Elmer Briant Thayer to be first lieutenant, Field Artillery.

James Stewart Neary to be first lieutenant, Field Artillery.

John Benjamin Allen to be first lieutenant, Signal Corps.

Norris Brown Harbold to be first lieutenant, Air Corps.

John Cogswell Oakes to be first lieutenant, Field Artillery.

Leslie George Ross to be first lieutenant, Coast Artillery Corps.

George Raymond Bienfang to be first lieutenant, Air Corps.

Roger Woodhull Goldsmith to be first lieutenant, Field Artillery.

Russell Alger Wilson to be first lieutenant, Air Corps.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 18, 1934

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

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

Eternal God and our Heavenly Father, we thank Thee for the great souls of the past who have bowed at the altar of prayer. Here they found courage and guidance that opened the way for nobler living and larger achievements; we pray for renewal of strength. In the realm of clearer vision may we find our delight and health in the channels of service. Heavenly Father, let us not be consumed by the fever of living or exhaust our vital energies in endless stress and strain. Just put Thy hand upon our hearts; speak to us, and may we be smitten with the finer issues of life. O breathe Thy sweetness and rest into our souls. Allow hindrances and obstacles to become the luminous points for our victorious spirits. Blessed Lord, we pray for our people; bring their lives through the deeps up to the highest levels of plenty and happiness. For their sakes may we take pleasure in necessities and distresses. As we serve them, may we make a highway of joy straight through the deserts of want and privation for every man, woman, and child of every section of the Union. In the name of our Saviour. Amen.

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

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Horne, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed with an amendment, in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 7483. An act to provide minimum pay for postal substitutes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and a concurrent resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1800. An act to provide for an investigation and report of losses resulting from the campaign for the eradication of the Mediterranean fruit fly by the Department of Agriculture;

S. 3235. An act to amend an act entitled "An act providing for the participation of the United States in A Century of