Mr. BYRNES. I ask that the Army nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Army nominations are confirmed en bloc.

That completes the calendar.

RECESS

Mr. GLASS. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, March 18, 1935, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 16 (legislative day of Wednesday, Mar. 13), 1935

SUPERINTENDENT OF UNITED STATES MINT

Edwin H. Dressel to be superintendent of the Mint of the United States at Philadelphia.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

A. Raymond Raff to be collector of customs, customs collection district no. 11, Philadelphia.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

MEDICAL CORPS

John Dupre Dupre to be first lieutenant.

Aloysius Thomas Waskowicz to be first lieutenant.

APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY

First Lt. Elbert Kelly to Quartermaster Corps.

Capt. Charles Kellogg McAlister to Finance Department.

First Lt. John Honeycutt Hinrichs to Ordnance Department.

First Lt. Haskell Hadley Cleaves to Signal Corps.

Second Lt. Harry Stephen Bishop to Air Corps.

Second Lt. Charles Albert Clark, Jr., to Air Corps.

Second Lt. David Nicholas Crickette to Air Corps.

Second Lt. Paul R. Gowen to Air Corps.

Second Lt. Robert Broussard Landry to Air Corps.

Second Lt. Samuel Abner Mundell to Air Corps.

Second Lt. John Morgan Price to Air Corps.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

Walter Moore to be lieutenant colonel, Infantry.

Edwin Henry Haskins to be major, Infantry.

Samuel Powell Walker, Jr., to be captain, Cavalry.

Allan Gullick Fadness to be first lieutenant, Infantry.

Mark Lorin Ireland to be colonel, Quartermaster Corps.

Charles Avery Dravo to be colonel, Infantry.

Charles Roberts Pettis to be colonel, Corps of Engineers.

Oscar Wolverton Griswold to be lieutenant colonel, Infantry.

Harding Polk to be lieutenant colonel, Cavalry.

Robert Horace Dunlop to be lieutenant colonel, Adjutant General's Department.

Emil Fred Reinhardt to be lieutenant colonel, Infantry.

Calvin Earl Giffin to be major, Air Corps.

Gustaf Hugh Ericson to be major, Coast Artillery.

Frederick Lofquist to be major, Coast Artillery Corps.

John Harold Wilson to be major, Coast Artillery Corps.

Napoleon Boudreau to be major, Coast Artillery Corps.

George Peterson Winton to be major, Field Artillery.

John Harrison Stokes, Jr., to be captain, Infantry.

Jesse Ellis Graham to be captain, Infantry.

Jerome David Cambre to be captain, Infantry.

Burrowes Goldthwaite Stevens to be captain, Infantry.

Alexander Thomas McCone to be captain, Field Artillery.

Thomas Markham Brinkley to be captain, Infantry.

Reginald Worth Hubbell to be captain, Infantry.

Donald William Sawtelle to be captain, Cavalry.

Paul Wilkins Kendall to be captain, Infantry.

Charles Henry Moore, Jr., to be captain, Infantry.

James Wentworth Freeman to be captain, Ordnance Department.

Alexander John Mackenzie to be captain, Infantry.

Wiley Vinton Carter to be captain, Signal Corps.

Ira Platt Swift to be captain, Cavalry.

Wilbur Eugene Dunkelberg to be captain, Infantry.

Arthur Pulsifer to be captain, Signal Corps.

Charles Freeman Kearney to be first lieutenant, Infantry.

Julian Broster Lindsey to be first lieutenant, Infantry.

Robert Lawrence Love to be first lieutenant, Infantry.

Thomas Norfleet Griffin to be first lieutenant, Infantry.

George Frederick Conner to be first lieutenant, Infantry.

Clebert Leon Hail to be first lieutenant, Infantry.

Arthur Knight Noble to be first lieutenant, Infantry.

Samuel Edwin Mays, Jr., to be first lieutenant, Infantry.

Robert Campbell Johnson to be first lieutenant, Infantry.

Robert Van Meter Smith to be first lieutenant, Infantry.

George Van Millett, Jr. to be first lieutenant, Infantry.

Lionel Theodore Roosevelt Trotter to be first lieutenant, Infantry.

Edwin Michael Van Bibber to be first lieutenant, Infantry.

Whitside Miller to be first lieutenant, Infantry.

George Elston Price to be first lieutenant, Air Corps.

Richard Clark Lindsay to be first lieutenant, Air Corps.

John Gordon Fowler to be first lieutenant, Air Corps.

John Lyle Nedwed to be first lieutenant, Air Corps.

PROMOTION IN THE PHILIPPINE SCOUTS

Eustaquio Sabio Baclig to be captain, Philippine Scouts.

POSTMASTERS

ILLINOIS

Frank R. Dalton, Aurora.

Joseph O. Hucker, Jr., Lake Villa.

INDIANA

Clarence A. Thompson, Columbus.

Albert Seufert, Ferdinand.

Jesse M. Kemp, Kempton.

Henry E. Delp, Marshall.

Rolla E. Pinaire, Ramsey.

IOWA

Floyd Finney, Arlington.

Henry S. King, Ashton.

George P. Rounds, Clermont.

J. Joseph Bonnstetter, Corwith.

Ida Belle Stokes, Emerson.

Martha E. O'Connor, Gilman.

Clarence H. Kemler, Marshalltown.

John E. Amdor, Massena.

Denton N. Layman, Newell.

Jennie E. Cagley, Plainfield.

Lynn O. Smith, Rockford.

Irene C. Schmidt, West Point.

MONTANA

Clarence W. Hektner, Dutton.

D. Francis Crowley, Lewistown.

James J. Price, Three Forks.

OKLAHOMA

Benjamin M. Luton, Jr., Lindsay.

W. Clarence Ray, Wilburton.

VIRGINIA

Mary Drewry, Capron.

James D. Crawford, Keysville.

Homo D. Gleason, Lovingston.

Jessie S. Overby, Stanleytown.

William T. Fosque, Wachapreague.

SENATE

MONDAY, MARCH 18, 1935

(Legislative day of Wednesday, Mar. 13, 1935)

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

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. ROBINSON, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Saturday, March 16, 1935, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Haltigan, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 6718) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and for the Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

CALL OF THE ROLL

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

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

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

Mr. AUSTIN. I announce the absence of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] because of illness, and ask that the announcement stand for the day.

Mr. LEWIS. I announce that the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY] and the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] are absent because of illness, and that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. DUFFY], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE], the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] are necessarily detained from the Senate.

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

PAYMENT OF ADJUSTED-SERVICE CERTIFICATES

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I am daily in receipt of many telegrams regarding the payment, before their maturity, of the adjusted-service compensation certificates.

The expense, in the form of telegraph tolls, of replying to all these telegrams would at this time be too heavy to be borne by the contingent fund of the Senate. Therefore I ask unanimous consent to have read at the clerk's desk copy of a letter I have mailed to a constituent regarding the payment of the certificates. This letter may be taken as a reply to all the telegrams I have received on this subject.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will read, as requested.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

MARCH 11, 1935.

Mr. SAM C. BAKER,
Winkelman, Ariz.

DEAR MR. BAKER: Your letter of March 4 received requesting the payment of the adjusted-service (compensation) certificates before their maturity.

During the years when no deficit existed in the Federal finances I supported the adjusted-service (compensation) legislation, and I do not believe I made any mistake in so voting.

The question of cashing the adjusted-service (compensation) certificates before their maturity depends now upon the condition of the Federal Treasury.

If the Treasury may without disaster cash these certificates before they fall due, I should, so far as I am able to perceive at this time, be inclined to vote to cash the certificates now, provided always the Treasury may stand the strain.

If, however, the Treasury may not meet this demand and could not pay the certificates before maturity, I would not vote, and could not be expected to vote, to bring a collapse of our national credit. It is a principle of my personal and political conduct, and the same principle should guide governments, never to hold out a promise where such promise is obviously incapable of fulfillment; in other words, do not make promises unless you are certain you can translate the promises into actuality.

I decline to make promises that cannot be fulfilled.

I refuse to raise up hopes that I know will be dashed to the ground.

I shall indeed give careful consideration to and make a close investigation of the question of the ability of the Treasury to pay these certificates before their maturity.

I realize that the phrase "give careful consideration and make a close examination" is sometimes used as a polite euphemism for postponed negation, but I am not using the phrase in that sense, for I shall examine the subject in the hope of finding that the Treasury's condition may justify my voting to pay the certificates before they are actually due; and if, upon investigation, the facts show that the Treasury cannot stand that strain, I shall not be a party to an insincere gesture of pretending to pay an immature obligation out of an empty Treasury.

Kind regards.

Cordially yours, HENRY F. ASHURST.

IMPORTATIONS OF WHEAT, CORN, AND OATS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a telegram from the secretary of the Senate of the State of Nebraska, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LINCOLN, NEBR., *March 16, 1935.*

HON. JOHN N. GARNER,
Vice President of the United States,
Washington, D. C.:

Resolution memorializing the President of the United States to prevent and exclude further importations of corn, wheat, and oats (introduced by Senators Brady, of Holt, and Cady, of Washington)

Whereas the Federal Government, in cooperation with distressed agriculture, has through the Agricultural Adjustment Administration been causing the curtailment and reduction of the production of wheat, corn, and oats in the United States; and

Whereas the announced purpose of such curtailment and reduction is to eliminate burdensome surpluses and to raise the price level to equality with manufactured products; and

Whereas wheat, corn, and oats have been and are now being imported into this country in direct competition with our own farmers; and

Whereas such importations are interfering with our own producers selling their grain in their own markets, which not only affects prices now but will in turn lower the prices on our 1935 crop; and

Whereas there are sufficient grains above-named for human and livestock consumption in the United States at this time: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Nebraska in fiftieth regular session assembled, That it is the sense of this senate that the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, respectfully petitioned and requested to exercise the power now vested in him under existing emergency laws to prevent and exclude further importations of wheat, corn, and oats into the United States until and unless a shortage becomes apparent which may threaten the proper sustenance of the people and the livestock of our country;

That the secretary of the senate be directed and instructed forthwith to forward a copy of this resolution, properly authenticated and suitably engrossed, to the President of the United States after said resolution shall have been spread at large upon the senate journal.

HUGO F. SRB,
Secretary of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following concurrent memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

House Concurrent Memorial 2

To the President and the Congress of the United States of America:

Your memorialist, the Legislature of the State of Arizona, respectfully represents:

Whereas serious antireligious outbreaks have occurred in Mexico under the regime of the national revolutionary party; and

Whereas the persecutions of Christians of all faiths now being practiced in Mexico have aroused indignation and protest throughout the civilized world; and

Whereas American citizens of the Christian faiths have been outraged and reviled, their homes invaded, their civil rights abridged, and their lives placed in jeopardy; and

Whereas the vindictive antireligious policy of the present Mexican Government has arbitrarily and unwarrantably restricted the number of ministers, priests, and rabbis permitted to officiate in some States within the boundaries of Mexico and has in other States entirely forbidden and prohibited the ordinary spiritual administration of clergymen of all creeds, thus resulting in the complete denial of the right of the people to practice the religion of their own choosing; and

Whereas it has been the national policy of the Government and the dominant revolutionary party of Mexico to discourage religious profession and obliterate religious worship; and

Whereas the present Mexican Government prohibits the time-honored practice of private religious instruction and education of children and compels parents as an only alternative to ignorance

to educate their children in schools teaching hostility to orthodox religion; and

Whereas such antireligious activity in Mexico is contrary to the tradition of freedom of conscience and liberty of religious worship which are the cherished attributes of all civilized governments; and

Whereas many distinguished leaders of the Protestant, Jewish, and Catholic faiths as well as outstanding religious and interdenominational organizations and societies have emphatically denounced and registered protest against such policies of the present Government of Mexico; and

Whereas the Government of Mexico has even encouraged an economic boycott against those sincerely professing and practicing the Christian religion; and

Whereas Christians are expelled from public office and driven from professions; and

Whereas Christian residents of Mexico who complain of such intolerance are flagrantly mistreated and abused; wherefore your memorialist prays:

That the resolution introduced into the United States Senate by Senator BORAH, condemning the cruelties and brutalities accompanying the present policy and authorizing the Committee on Foreign Relations of the United States Senate or a subcommittee thereof to conduct hearings and receive such evidence as may be presented relating to religious persecution, be adopted by the United States Senate.

And your memorialist will ever pray.

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

A joint resolution requesting the Senators and the Members of the House of Representatives from North Carolina in the Congress of the United States to vote against a bill known as the "Flannigan bill" relating to Government grading of tobacco

Whereas it is the sense of the General Assembly of North Carolina that the passage of the Flannigan bill relating to the Government grading of tobacco will work a great hardship on the farmers, warehousemen, and others interested in the handling of tobacco in North Carolina and will not be beneficial to anyone: Therefore be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring):

SECTION 1. That the Members of the United States Senate and the House of Representatives from North Carolina in the United States Congress be, and they are hereby, requested to vote and to use their influence against the passage of that bill now pending in the United States Congress known as the "Flannigan bill" relating to the Government grading of tobacco.

SEC. 2. That a certified copy of this resolution be filed by the Governor of North Carolina to the Congress of the United States and to each of the Members thereof from North Carolina.

SEC. 3. That this resolution shall be in full force and effect from and after its ratification.

In the general assembly, read three times, and ratified this 8th day of March 1935.

A. H. GRAHAM,
President of the Senate.
R. G. JOHNSON,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate the following joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

A joint resolution memorializing the President and Congress of the United States to amend the Federal law so as to permit the States to tax national banks upon a fair and equitable basis and requesting the States to join in a similar memorial

Whereas the several States are prohibited from taxing the property, income, or shares of national banks except in the precise method prescribed by Congress (sec. 5219 R. S. U. S.); and

Whereas from 1866 to 1923 the only method by which Congress authorized the States to tax national banks was to tax upon their shares and during such period such shares were taxed by the States at the property rate, upon the same basis as the property of the farmer, merchants, manufacturer, and home owner, thereby securing equality of the burden of taxation among all property owners; and

Whereas said Federal statute provided that the rate of such tax should not exceed the rate imposed by the State upon other moneyed capital in the hands of individual citizens of the States invested in notes, bonds, and other evidences of debt (moneys and credits) coming into competition with the business of banking; and

Whereas beginning in 1921 and continuing down to the present time there have been rendered various decisions of the United States Supreme Court and other Federal and State courts, construing the above limitation, the effect of which decisions has been to practically destroy the power of the States to tax the shares of national banks, it being manifestly impossible to classify such investments into those competing and those not competing with the business of national banks. It is also clearly evident that there is no similarity or relationship between shares in a national bank which have a right to share in the profits of a going business arising from the income from all the deposits in the bank as well the capital invested in shares, and also to share in the income received from other activities of such bank and a debt evidenced by a note or bond, the income from which is limited to the interest provided therein. It is absurd to claim that for purposes of taxation such wholly different types of property should be treated precisely alike; and

Whereas although the Federal act in form permits States to tax the net income of banks or to levy a tax measured by or according to such net income, such method is entirely and wholly unjust, inequitable, and inadequate. Because, first, when such method is used by a State it is in lieu of all other forms of taxation. Second, any such bank is entirely tax free unless it makes a net profit, whereas all other persons, owners of property, must pay a tax whether they make a profit or loss. This places the national banks in a privileged class and exempts them from paying any share of the public burdens during the period when they do not make a net profit, thus shifting their share of the tax burden upon other property owners. Third, in all the States where the net income, or measured by net income methods have been used, the shrinkage in taxes collected from banks have ranged from 66⅔ percent to 90 percent, as compared to former tax collections under the share tax plan; and

Whereas because of the decisions of courts holding void taxes upon the shares of national banks the whole matter of taxing banks, both National and State, has been thrown into great confusion, many of the States have been persuaded to abandon the share method of taxing banks and have either adopted low millage rates of from 3 to 5 mills on the dollar of value of such stock, or have adopted the income tax, or measured by income-tax methods, with the result that in the past 10 years the total tax of national banks have been reduced from $79,376,000 in 1922 to $48,080,000 in 1932, notwithstanding the fact that during such period the total capital and surplus of such banks increased from $2,356,427,000 to $2,828,408,000, and thus during a period when taxes have increased upon all other forms of property and for all other persons banks have secured reductions; and

Whereas in March 1927 the Supreme Court of the United States held bank taxes in Minnesota to the amount of approximately $1,200,000 void because the rate was higher than the rate on moneys and credits and the legislature at once established the Minnesota Bank Tax Commission for the purpose of obtaining such an amendment to the Federal law as would permit this and other States to tax bank stock upon its value as other property is taxed; said commission has in all practicable ways endeavored to secure such amendment by enlisting the cooperation of all other States and other taxing officials, by appearing before committees of the Senate and House of Representatives of Congress of the United States, by attending national tax conferences, by correspondence with tax officials of all other States, and by conferences with them and otherwise; and

Whereas through the efforts of the said commission and the tax officials of other States bills have been introduced at every session of Congress providing for the necessary amendments to said Federal act, and by reason of the lobby maintained by the American Bankers Association all efforts to obtain such legislation have been unsuccessful; however, in June 1934 the Banking and Currency Committee of the House of Representatives reported favorably upon a bill introduced by Mr. STEAGALL, chairman of said committee, which bill would grant to the States all the relief required. Said report is an unanswerable argument in favor of restoring to the States the power to tax bank shares upon an equitable basis, the same as they were taxed for nearly 60 years; and

Whereas bills identical with the so-called Steagall bill have been introduced and are now pending in the Congress of the United States, and it is of the utmost importance that all of the States join in the effort to secure the passage thereof: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, That the Congress of the United States, the President of the United States, are hereby respectfully and earnestly urged to so amend section 5219, Revised Statutes of the United States, that the States may tax the shares of national banks upon the ad valorem basis with no other limitation thereof except that the rate be not greater than the rate imposed upon the shares of State banks; be it further

Resolved, That all the States of the United States are hereby earnestly urged and requested to adopt resolutions similar to this resolution memorializing Congress and the President of the United States to pass such legislation and to cooperate with the State of Minnesota for the purpose of securing the enactment of such legislation until the same is secured; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state of Minnesota is authorized and requested to send copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, Vice President of the United States, Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of the House of Representatives from the State of Minnesota, also to send a duly authenticated copy hereof to the presiding officer of each house of the legislature of all the States in the Union and to the chairman of the tax committees of each house thereof.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate the following concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor:

Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to appropriate $125,000 for relief of schools in Minnesota

Whereas the financial resources of about 60 school districts in Minnesota have been exhausted, and no funds are available for continuing such schools; and

Whereas such school districts are unable to obtain any funds from any existing agency in the State of Minnesota, and the indebtedness of said school districts exceeds the amount fixed by law; and

Whereas unless assistance is extended to such school districts it will necessitate the closing of about 60 schools and will throw out of employment about 250 teachers and other persons engaged in and about such schools, and will prevent approximately 6,500 pupils from attending school; and

Whereas unless financial relief is obtained for such schools the same will be forced to close within the next 30 days; and

Whereas it will require about $125,000 as aid to such schools in order that such schools may remain open during the balance of the term: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States by appropriate action make available for use of destitute school districts in Minnesota at least the sum of $125,000; and be it further

Resolved, That Congress adopt as a future policy a direct appropriation to the several States for school purposes; that such appropriation should be equivalent to at least $25 per pupil, and without Federal restraint as to how such appropriations shall be expended or distributed; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forthwith transmitted by the secretary of state to all Members of Congress from the State of Minnesota, and to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to the President of the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate the following concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Iowa, which was referred to the Committee on Finance:

A concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to enact such laws as will insure the immediate cash payment of the adjusted-service certificates of the World War veterans

Whereas the immediate cash payment of the adjusted-service certificates will increase tremendously the purchasing power of millions of the consuming public, distributed uniformly throughout the Nation, and will provide relief for the holders thereof who are in dire need and distress because of the present unfortunate economic conditions and will lighten immeasurably the burden which cities, counties, and States are now required to carry for relief; and

Whereas the payment of said certificates will discharge and retire an acknowledged contract obligation of the Government; and

Whereas the Government of the United States is now definitely committed to the policy of providing additional sums of money for the purpose of hastening recovery from the present economic crisis: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives, State of Iowa (the senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States be respectfully memorialized to enact such laws as will insure the immediate cash payment of the adjusted-service certificates at face value, with cancelation of interest accrued and refund of interest paid; and be it further

Resolved, That each of the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Iowa be urged to support and assist in carrying out the purposes of this memorial; and be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk of the house be, and he is hereby, directed to forward a copy of this memorial to each of the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Iowa, and to the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, and to Representative PATMAN, of Texas, the author of H. R. 1.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin favoring the enactment of an adequate tariff law to protect the agricultural industry, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

(See joint resolution printed in full when presented today by Mr. LA FOLLETTE, p. 3799.)

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate a joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho favoring the enactment of legislation providing for immediate cash payment of adjusted-service certificates of World War veterans, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

(See joint memorial printed in full when presented by Mr. POPE on the 16th instant, p. 3784, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate a joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho favoring the enactment of legislation and the making of appropriations to carry to completion a project which will divert the natural flow from the Yellowstone Lake into Snake River, which was referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

(See joint memorial printed in full when presented by Mr. POPE on the 16th instant, p. 3784, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate a petition (sponsored by a committee of the National Chiropractic Association) of sundry citizens of San Antonio, Tex., praying for the issuance of an Executive order granting to all licensed practitioners of the healing arts equal rights and privileges in any social legislation involving these arts, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also laid before the Senate petitions of several citizens of Alabama, Michigan, New Mexico, and North Carolina, praying for the enactment of old-age-pension legislation, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also laid before the Senate the petition of J. E. Kreiss, of Los Angeles, Calif., praying for the financing of the so-called "soldiers' bonus" by means of a national lottery, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the Workers' School, New York City, N. Y., protesting against the enactment of alien and sedition legislation that might tend to suppress civil rights, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the employing printers of the Erie District, Erie, Pa., opposing the estabishment of a 30-hour work week under prevailing conditions, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also laid before the Senate petitions of sundry citizens of the States of Alabama, California, Connecticut, Georgia, Illinois, Iowa, Massachusetts, Michigan, Mississippi, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New York, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, and Wisconsin, praying for an investigation of charges filed by the Women's Committee of Louisiana relative to the qualifications of the Senators from Louisiana [Mr. LONG and Mr. OVERTON], which were referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from Jose B. Gamboa, of Silay, Occidental Negros, P. I., relative to problems affecting the Philippine Islands, which was referred to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

He also laid before the Senate a letter in the nature of a petition from a citizen of the United States, praying for the adoption of a security wage for relief workers of more than $50 per month, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also laid before the Senate a letter in the nature of a petition from a citizen of the State of Florida, praying for the granting of increased compensation to F. E. R. A. workers, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also laid before the Senate resolutions adopted by Council of Richmond Heights, Mo.; the City Councils of Chicago, Ill., and St. Paul, Minn., and the Common Councils of Norway, Mich., and East Providence, R. I., favoring the enactment of pending legislation proclaiming October 11 in each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. CAPPER presented a petition of members of the Reno County (Kans.) Medical Society, praying for the adoption of the plan of "health management" as promulgated by the American Medical Association, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. WALSH presented a petition of sundry citizens of Middleboro, Mass., praying for action to restore the natural attractiveness of the landscape adjacent to the Cape Cod Canal and Buzzards Bay, and the designing of new administration and other Federal buildings in that vicinity, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Monson, Mass., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation providing immediate cash payment of adjusted-service certificates of World War veterans, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of several citizens of Worcester, Mass., praying for the enactment of legislation pro-

viding immediate cash payment of adjusted-service certificates of World War veterans, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a resolution adopted by Local No. 11, Amalgamated Silver Workers' Union, of Taunton, Mass., favoring the enactment of legislation providing immediate cash payment of adjusted-service certificates of World War veterans, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a resolution adopted at the annual meeting of the Slovak League of America, Pittsburgh, Pa., favoring the passage of House bill 2827, known as the "Workers' Unemployment Old Age and Insurance Act", which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Democratic City Committee of Fall River, Mass., favoring the prompt enactment of the so-called "Dill bill", for the relief of needy superannuated persons, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Boston, Ashburnham, Braintree, East Braintree, Falmouth, Lincoln, Quincy, Waterville, Watertown, Weymouth, and Winchendon, all in the State of Massachusetts, remonstrating against the enactment of the bill (S. 1725) to provide for the control and elimination of public-utility holding companies operating, or marketing securities, in interstate and foreign commerce, etc., or similar legislation, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Kiwanis Club of Quincy, Mass., endorsing efforts of the National Crime Commission to secure the enactment of legislation to control and regulate the sale of firearms, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a resolution adopted by Local Union No. 1792, United Textile Workers of America, of Saxonville, Mass., opposing any change in the textile code increasing the hours of labor to more than 40 hours per week, and favoring a 30-hour work week, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a resolution adopted by Local Union No. 38, Boot and Shoe Workers' Union, of Boston, Mass., favoring the establishment of a fair minimum for the actual labor price per pair for the manufacture of Army, Navy, and service shoes to the end that all manufacturers will have an equal opportunity to make such shoes, relieve the overtime situation, and further the reemployment of shoe workers, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented petitions of several citizens of the State of Massachusetts, and a citizen of the State of Arizona, praying for the passage of the bill (H. R. 2857) to amend an act entitled "An act granting pensions to certain soldiers who served in the Indian wars from 1817 to 1898, and for other purposes", approved March 3, 1927, which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a letter in the nature of a petition from the Italian-American Citizens' Club, of Lowell, Mass., praying for the prompt passage of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 117) making appropriations for relief purposes, so as to help relieve unemployment in the granite industry, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. NORRIS presented the following resolution of the Senate of the State of Nebraska, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

Resolution to urge the Congress of the United States to expedite passage of the legislation that will make the Federal seed loan immediately available, and to secure the adoption of such departmental procedure as will make the seed loan available without delay

Whereas it appears that $60,000,000 appropriated for the Federal seed loan is dependent upon the passage and approval of the public works and relief bill now before Congress; and

Whereas a large number of farmers in the State of Nebraska cannot proceed with their work until they receive the seed loan; and

Whereas the experience in the past years has been that due to certain departmental procedure it requires from 2 to 3 weeks to receive the money for seed loans after the application has been made; and

Whereas delay in making the Federal loan available immediately and the delay in departmental procedure is a serious handicap to the farmers who desire seed loans: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Nebraska, fiftieth session assembled—

SECTION 1. That we request and urge the Members of the United States Senate from Nebraska, and the Representatives in Congress from Nebraska, that action be taken to expedite the passage of public-works relief bill, on which it appears the Federal seed loan is dependent, in order that there may be available without delay sufficient funds to enable the farmers of Nebraska who desire a seed loan to obtain the same in due time.

SEC. 2. That the Senate of the State of Nebraska further requests the Members of the United States Senate from Nebraska, and the Representatives in Congress from Nebraska, to immediately take up with the proper department the question of procedure in reference to obtaining the seed loans, so that the payment may be made without delay after the application has been made and filed.

SEC. 3. That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to each Member of the United States Senate and House of Representatives from Nebraska.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE presented the following joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, which was referred to the Committee on Finance:

Joint resolution urging Congress to enact tariffs to protect the agricultural industry

Whereas the President of the United States in his recent message to the Congress outlined the path to prosperity under the National Recovery Act, but little was said and small hope offered for the future of American agriculture; and

Whereas agriculture being the source of all wealth, the Nation can prosper only when the American farmer gets his fair share of prosperity; and

Whereas the present low tariff on farm products has brought to our markets the cheaply produced agricultural products of all the world, thus robbing the American farmer of the market that is rightly his and reducing him to the standard of living of a foreign peasant. American industry has greatly benefited by the low tariff on food products: First, by enabling foreign nations to sell their agricultural products in America and thereby create a trade balance which, in turn, enables them to buy the wares of American industry; second, the American industrialist demands that his laborer live cheaply, which they can do on cheap foreign-grown food, so that he can continue to pay them small wages. Agriculture now demands a new deal that it may have an even chance to regain its past glory and no longer be the prey of industry. The Government report for 1934 shows the value of agricultural products brought into this country is $1,000,000,000. One billion dollars is more money than was paid this year in corn-hog checks and in taking land out of production. By barring competitive farm products, by giving the American farmer the American market, more money can be given the farmer each year than the Government is now doing in all its relief schemes and doles combined; and

Whereas in spite of the fact that America is the greatest agricultural country on earth, able to amply supply its own markets with farm products of nearly all kinds and have much left to export, it does import vast quantities of food from all the world; such as, butter and cheese from Denmark, Holland, and New Zealand; canned beef and hides from the Argentine; rye for distilling from Poland; barley and malt from Canada; sugar from Cuba; and vegetable oils from the Orient to compete with American butterfats; and other supplies from other lands; and all permitted to enter under the existing low tariff; and

Whereas, according to the Wisconsin Department of Markets, Wisconsin produced about 8,000,000 bushels of rye in 1924, for which we received an average of $1.09 per bushel; in 1934 Wisconsin produced less than 2,000,000 bushels of rye, for which we received less than 75 cents per bushel; and during 1934 our millers and distillers imported around 15,000,000 bushels of rye from Poland and the Argentine, thereby placing Wisconsin farmers in direct competition with the peasants of Poland and the peons of South America and destroying our market for rye, while the distillers of whisky are amply protected from all foreign competition by high tariffs. According to our department of markets, Wisconsin farmers have increased their acreage of rye by 14 percent for 1935 and the crop is reported at 93 percent of normal; therefore, we demand that the Wisconsin farmers be protected this year from further importation of rye so that our own market shall be secure to Wisconsin farmers, thereby securing to us an adequate price for our rye: Therefore be it

Resolved by the senate (the assembly concurring), That the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin respectfully demands that the Congress of the United States enact an adequate protective tariff to protect the products of American farmers against foreign competition and to save the home market for the American farmer, to whom it rightfully belongs; and be it further

Resolved, That this legislature respectfully petitions the national administration to make no further reciprocal tariff or trade agreements by which the interests of American farmers are sacrificed; and be it further

Resolved, That properly attested copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of the Treasury, to both Houses of Congress, and to each Wisconsin Representative in Congress.

Mr. NYE presented the following resolution of the Senate of the State of North Dakota, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

Senate Resolution J

Whereas by act of Congress cattle have been added to the list of basic commodities and thus subjected to adjustment-price benefits; and

Whereas the United States Government has acquired title to approximately a million head of North Dakota cattle under the drought cattle-buying program; and

Whereas the producers of said cattle received about 25 percent of the cost of producing same; and

Whereas such producers are entitled to cost of production or a parity price under the Agricultural Adjustment Act; and

Whereas cattle producers of North Dakota, under the Agricultural Adjustment Act, are entitled to adjustment benefit payments in the amount of about $40,000,000 if they are to receive parity prices for the cattle disposed of; and

Whereas about 90 percent of said cattle were mortgaged for more than was paid for them; and

Whereas cattle producers are unable to meet the obligations secured by the cattle so disposed of, and unless the producers receive just compensation for their cattle it is going to work a hardship on banks, credit companies, and other mortgage holders in this and other States largely supported with Government money; and

Whereas we are informed that the Agricultural Adjustment Administration has not started to work out a program which will regulate cattle production: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we urge upon the Agricultural Adjustment Administration to work out a cattle program as soon as possible and provide for adjustment benefits to the end that parity prices may be obtained for cattle and the producers of cattle enabled to reestablish their almost depleted estates; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Secretary of Agriculture at Washington, D. C., and to our Senators and Congressmen in Washington urging them to do all in their power to help get an equitable cattle program started.

A. S. MARSHALL,
President pro tempore of the Senate.
F. E. TUNELL,
Secretary of the Senate.

Mr. NYE also presented the following concurrent resolutions of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

Senate Concurrent Resolution A–H

Be it resolved by the Senate of the State of North Dakota (the house of representatives concurring):

Whereas during the present depression the original cost of producing meat and grain products is greatly in excess of the price now realized by the sale of the same, and that by reason thereof farmers are unable to pay their bills and debts and each year find themselves further behind with their debts and obligations, and if the above situation continues for any additional length of time the farmers will lose their homes and all; and

Whereas during the time farmers are operating at a loss they cannot be purchasers of other manufactured products, and such industries will, in turn, fail for lack of business, and that all business of every kind and nature will be affected by this injustice to agriculture; and

Whereas it follows that every kind of business located in the agricultural communities must rise or fall with the farmers, and that the important and absolutely essential industry of agriculture cannot be stricken down without causing disaster to the country as a whole; and

Whereas the placing of an embargo on the products mentioned would stabilize the prices thereof and bring such prices more in harmony with the production costs, together with a fair margin of profit, and bring the farmers out of the dire and distressing depression which now affects them: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Twenty-fourth Legislative Assembly of the State of North Dakota, That we respectfully petition the Congress of the United States to pass laws and provide rules and regulations to place an embargo on flax, wheat, hogs, cattle, and sheep, and upon pork, beef, and mutton products, until such time as the prices of said grains, livestock, and meat products shall cover the cost of production; and we further petition that the law now permitting wheat to be milled in bond be repealed; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, to both Houses of the Congress of the United States and each Member thereof from this State, to the Secretary of Agriculture, and to each house of the legislative assembly of those States whose legislatures are now in session.

A. S. MARSHALL,
President pro tempore of the Senate.
F. E. TUNELL,
Secretary of the Senate.
WILLIAM M. CROCKETT,
Speaker of the House.
WALTER S. MARTIN,
Chief Clerk of the House.

Senate Concurrent Resolution A–C

Memorializing Congress to establish prices on major farm products that will insure cost of production plus a reasonable profit

Whereas the Government of the United States has assisted practically every class of business in the Nation to carry on during this period of depression; and

Whereas to do so codes have been formulated and regulations and rules have been agreed upon to allow a return for money invested and labor performed; and

Whereas the farming industry, the largest industry of this United States, an industry in which nearly a third of our population is actively engaged; and

Whereas this industry is the lifeblood of the Nation, the real producer of all wealth, and conducted by an honest, untiring citizenry toiling long days and in many cases deprived of the luxuries and pleasures enjoyed by other classes and professions; and

Whereas even in times of prosperity in other lines of business the farmer was, even by strict economy, gradually losing; and

Whereas many thousands of farm homes have been lost annually, and which is lowering the morale of the greatest industry of our Nation and hindering the return of prosperity to this country at this time; and

Whereas the cause for this condition of our farming industry has been "a price below the cost of production": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of North Dakota (the house of representatives concurring), That this Legislative Assembly of North Dakota respectfully memorialize the Congress of the United States to establish prices on all major products of the farms of this Nation that will give the owners and tillers thereof the cost of production plus a reasonable profit; and be it further

Resolved, That attested copies of this resolution be sent to both Houses of the Congress of the United States, to each of the Members thereof from this State, to the Secretary of Agriculture, all of Washington, D. C., and to the State legislatures of the farming States of this Nation.

A. S. MARSHALL,
President pro tempore of the Senate.
F. E. TUNELL,
Secretary of the Senate.
WILLIAM M. CROCKETT,
Speaker of the House.
WALTER S. MARTIN,
Chief Clerk of the House.

Senate Concurrent Resolution T

Be it enacted by the Senate of the State of North Dakota (the house of representatives concurring)—

Whereas a large percentage of the farmers of the State of North Dakota are experiencing a shortage of feed for their livestock because of crop failure in the year 1934 by reason of the drought, and have not the means with which to purchase sufficient grains for feeding purposes at their present high prices; and

Whereas farmers are receiving Federal aid for the purchasing of feed to sustain their livestock, but that the aid or relief provided is inadequate with which to purchase sufficient feed at present high prices, even though the Federal allowance has been increased about 50 percent, since feed has also appreciated in price in about the same proportion; and

Whereas a large number of livestock have perished and many more will perish unless relief can be had; and

Whereas large quantities of feed, consisting of oats, barley, and low grades of wheat fit for feeding purposes, are available in the Dominion of Canada at considerably lower prices than prevail here, and that the importation of feed grains would not in any way prove detrimental to the agriculture industry of this State or of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Twenty-fourth Legislative Assembly of the State of North Dakota, That we respectfully petition the President of the United States, the Honorable Franklin D. Roosevelt, and the Congress of the United States to permit limited quantities of feed grains to be shipped into the United States, duty free, and in sufficient amount to relieve the acute feed situation that now prevails, and thereby prevent large losses by starvation of livestock in this and adjoining States; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to President Franklin D. Roosevelt, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, Congressmen WILLIAM LEMKE and USHER L. BURDICK, and United States Senators LYNN J. FRAZIER and GERALD P. NYE.

A. S. MARSHALL,
President pro tempore of the Senate.
F. E. TUNELL,
Secretary of the Senate.
WILLIAM M. CROCKETT,
Speaker of the House.
WALTER S. MARTIN,
Chief Clerk of the House.

Senate Concurrent Resolution X

A concurrent resolution endorsing proposed shelter-belt project

Whereas trees have proven a great boon to mankind and are a priceless heritage to posterity; and

Whereas successful experiments in tree planting under all kinds of conditions have been conducted by the Federal experiment sta-

tion at Mandan, the several substations, the State school of forestry at Bottineau, and by private enterprise in North Dakota; and

Whereas the President, Hon. Franklin D. Roosevelt, has proposed a forest shelter belt to extend through a number of Great Plains States, including North Dakota, for the purpose of minimizing the destructive influences of winds and conserving the natural moisture of the region; and

Whereas recent droughts have emphasized the necessity for such protection and conservation, and the need for appropriate early action is urgent: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of North Dakota (the house of representatives concurring), That we express our appreciation of this forward-looking plan to benefit agricultural and allied industries in this section, and as such vital to the entire Nation; and

That we endorse the proposal in its entirely; and

That we respectfully urge the Congress of the United States to enact legislation and make the necessary appropriations to carry into effect the Great Plains shelter-belt project; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state is instructed and directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Secretary of Agriculture, and to each of the Senators and Representatives in Congress from this State.

A. S. MARSHALL,
President pro tempore of the Senate.
F. E. TUNELL,
Secretary of the Senate.
WILLIAM M. CROCKETT,
Speaker of the House.
WALTER S. MARTIN,
Chief Clerk of the House.

Mr. NYE also presented the following resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

House Resolution F

BANK OF THE UNITED STATES

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota:

That whereas the Honorable WILLIAM LEMKE has introduced in the Congress of the United States an act for the establishment of the Bank of the United States, with broad powers in connection with issuance of currency, and controlling the credit of the Nation; and

Whereas the present banking system is largely responsible for the deplorable financial condition this great country of ours finds itself in today; and

Whereas the people of the State of North Dakota have had experience with and are definitely committed to a State-owned bank; and

Whereas we believe that a nationally owned bank can do for the Nation what the Bank of North Dakota has done for this State: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we commend Congressman LEMKE for his acts in this matter and urge all representatives of the common people to place the full weight of their influence behind said measure to the end that it may become an actuality as soon as possible; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Secretary of the Senate and Clerk of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to Hon. WILLIAM LEMKE, Hon. USHER L. BURDICK, Hon. LYNN J. FRAZIER, and Hon. GERALD P. NYE.

WILLIAM M. CROCKETT,
Speaker of the House.
WALTER S. MARTIN,
Chief Clerk of the House.

Mr. NYE also presented the following concurrent resolutions of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, which were referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Senate Concurrent Resolution R

Whereas the Bank of North Dakota is organized and established by the State of North Dakota and is part of the State of North Dakota functioning in its sovereign capacity; and

Whereas the Bank of North Dakota is backed and guaranteed by all resources of the State in its sovereign capacity and is one of the soundest financial institutions in the United States; and

Whereas the State of North Dakota in due course of its business issues bonds and securities for the proper financing of its business and its institutions, which said bonds and securities are all within the limitations prescribed by the laws of the State of North Dakota and are guaranteed and backed by the integrity and all the resources of the State; and

Whereas the State of North Dakota makes use of the Bank of North Dakota to handle and purchase these bonds and securities; and

Whereas the Bank of North Dakota has on hand and does handle a large amount of these State bonds and securities as part of its resources and reserves; and

Whereas it would be of great advantage and benefit to the State of North Dakota in the proper financing of its business enterprises and its institutions that the Bank of North Dakota should be authorized, empowered, and permitted to pledge with the United States Treasury such of the bonds and securities of the State of North Dakota handled by the Bank of North Dakota, and be further authorized and permitted to issue currency in place thereof. In this matter the Bank of North Dakota would not be required to borrow money for short-time financing and pay interest thereon; and

Whereas an act of Congress is necessary to qualify the Bank of North Dakota to take advantage of this medium of financing: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of North Dakota (the house of representatives concurring therein), That we petition the United States Congress now assembled to enact the proper and necessary law qualifying the Bank of North Dakota to participate in the facilities of the United States Treasury for the issuing of currency in the name of the Bank of North Dakota secured by a deposit of the bonds of the State of North Dakota and acceptable State securities; and be it further

Resolved, That we petition the United States Treasury and Comptroller of the Currency to make such rules and regulations as will give to the Bank of North Dakota, as a sovereign institution of the State of North Dakota, the facilities for issuing of currency; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of North Dakota be, and is hereby, instructed to forward an authenticated copy of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Honorable Franklin D. Roosevelt, to the President of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives at Washington, D. C., to the Secretary and to the Comptroller of the United States Treasury, and to the two United States Senators and two Representatives from North Dakota in Congress.

A. S. MARSHALL,
President pro tempore of the Senate.
F. E. TUNELL,
Secretary of the Senate.
WILLIAM M. CROCKETT,
Speaker of the House.
WALTER S. MARTIN,
Chief Clerk of the House.

Senate Concurrent Resolution A–B

Be it resolved by the Senate of the State of North Dakota (the house of representatives concurring):

Whereas the United States Constitution under article 1, section 8, providing for powers granted to Congress among other things specifically provides "the Congress shall have power to coin money, regulate the value thereof and of foreign coin, and fix the standard of weights and measures."

Whereas, this function and governmental power has been turned over to the national banks, and thereby placed in the practical control of such banks; and

Whereas the use and abuse of this power has placed the economic direction and control of our country in the hands of a few men, and thereby determining its destiny; and,

Whereas by reason of the delegation of this governmental power, a few men own the great mass of wealth and property in this country; and,

Whereas the result of such system was foretold by Jefferson who said, "Already they have raised up a money aristocracy that has set the Government at defiance. The issuing power should be taken from the banks and restored to the Government, and the people, to whom it rightfully belongs", and Lincoln said, "The money power of the country will endeavor to prolong its reign by working upon the prejudices of the people, until all wealth is aggregated in a few hands and the Republic is destroyed. I feel at this time more anxious for my country than even in the midst of war"; and Woodrow Wilson said, "The great monopoly in this country is the money monopoly. So long as that exists our liberty and freedom and individual energy of development are out of the question. * * * This is the greatest question of all; and to this, statesmen must address themselves with an earnest determination to serve the long future and the true liberties of men"; and

Whereas it is necessary that this great power be restored to the Government and its people, even though the hour is late: Now, therefore,

We urge upon Congress the passage of all necessary laws to reestablish the issuing of money as a monopoly of government, and that there be established a system of Government banks exclusively owned, to the end that a bank system be provided for the people at cost; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and the Senators and Congressmen from North Dakota.

A. S. MARSHALL,
President pro tempore of the Senate.
F. E. TUNELL,
Secretary of the Senate.
WILLIAM M. CROCKETT,
Speaker of the House.
WALTER S. MARTIN,
Chief Clerk of the House.

Mr. NYE also presented the following concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce:

House Concurrent Resolution A–12

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota (the senate concurring), That—

Whereas it is the sense of the members of the legislative assembly of the State of North Dakota that the Government of the United States should perform its solemn promise and place American agriculture on a basis of equality with other industries by providing an adequate system of roads for the transportation of agricultural products, and that adequate legislation to that end should be adopted at the earliest possible date; and

Whereas hundreds of farmers living in western North Dakota are not now provided with an adequate system of roads and bridges by means of which they can exchange products and move other products to market without paying toll-bridge charges; and

Whereas it is the function of the Federal Government to build bridges across navigable streams and to provide an adequate system of Federal highways; and

Whereas a highway bridge across the Yellowstone River near Cartwright, McKenzie County, N. Dak., will add greatly to the prosperity of agriculture in western North Dakota and provide a means of interchange of agricultural products and make available to the farmers in the dry-land areas of western North Dakota the abundant feed and vegetable supplies of the irrigated districts of the Yellowstone Valley; and

Whereas the construction of this bridge would aid greatly in the completion of the Federal-highway system in western North Dakota: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota (the senate concurring), That we respectfully request the construction of this bridge and that it be considered a Federal project and the same be constructed from Federal relief funds recently granted by Congress and that the work of the construction of said bridge, as far as possible, be contributed by relief labor; this bridge to be built on Federal Highway No. 23 near Cartwright in McKenzie County, N. Dak.; and be it further

Resolved, That duly engrossed copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Hon. Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States, to the Bureau of Public Roads in Washington, D. C., to the Federal Relief Administrator in Washington, and to the North Dakota Highway Commissioner, and to the United States Senators and Members of the House of Representatives from North Dakota.

WILLIAM M. CROCKETT,
Speaker of the House.
WALTER S. MARTIN,
Chief Clerk of the House.
A. S. MARSHALL,
President pro tempore of the Senate.
F. E. TUNELL,
Secretary of the Senate.

Mr. NYE also presented the following joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, which was referred to the Committee on Finance:

Senate Joint Resolution F

Memorializing Congress to grant consent to taxation by the several States of certain interstate sales

Whereas necessity for property-tax relief is imperative in North Dakota, as well as in other States throughout the Union; and

Whereas 26 States in an effort to afford property-tax relief and to provide revenue for essential functions of government have enacted laws imposing taxes based upon or measured by sales of tangible personal property purchased and delivered in such States; and

Whereas no less than 65 percent of the population of the United States now reside in States with such laws; and

Whereas by virtue of judicial interpretation of the Federal Constitution the States may not levy, without the consent of Congress, taxes based upon or measured by sales moving in interstate commerce; and

Whereas as a result of such an interpretation there is a discrimination in favor of interstate sales as against intrastate sales; and

Whereas such discrimination, if permitted to continue, will tend to divert business from normal channels in North Dakota and elsewhere throughout the Union, thus subjecting local merchants to unfair competition; and

Whereas it is of vital importance to the welfare of the people of the United States that all things be done to promote the stability of local business in order that the financial structure of North Dakota and other States throughout the Union may be preserved; and

Whereas it rests within the power of Congress to permit the States to levy nondiscriminatory taxes upon sales in interstate commerce; and

Whereas there is pending in Congress Senate File No. 2897, introduced by Hon. PAT HARRISON, Senator from Mississippi, a bill to enable the States to tax such interstate shipments of goods; and

Whereas said measure was passed by the Senate on March 15, 1934, but was not voted upon by the House of Representatives and hence did not become law; and

Whereas need for such legislation is imperative in order to correct grave injustice in North Dakota and in all other States throughout the Union where taxes are based upon or measured by sales of tangible personal property: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislative Assembly of the State of North Dakota, That the Congress of the United States be, and it is hereby, memorialized to give relief to the State of North Dakota and all other States imposing taxes based upon or measured by sales of tangible personal property by immediately providing for the regulation of interstate commerce through granting consent to taxation by the several States of certain interstate sales as provided by the measure (S. 2897) introduced by Senator HARRISON during the second session of the Seventy-third Congress; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the presiding officers of the legislative bodies of all other States of the United States, with the request that they transmit similar memorials to Congress, and that copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, to each of the Members from North Dakota of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States, and the Honorable PAT HARRISON, United States Senator from Mississippi, author of the measure which would afford the States relief in this important matter.

A. S. MARSHALL,
President pro tempore of the Senate.
F. E. TUNELL,
Secretary of the Senate.
WILLIAM M. CROCKETT,
Speaker of the House.
WALTER S. MARTIN,
Chief Clerk of the House.

Mr. NYE also presented the following concurrent resolutions of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, which were referred to the Committee on Finance:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 1

Be it resolved by the Senate of the State of North Dakota (the house of representatives concurring therein):

Whereas the problem of old-age security has become a leading public issue; and

Whereas the people of the State of North Dakota have become conscious of the need for Federal legislation aiming to make dependent old age more secure; and

Whereas many thousands of the people of this State have endorsed and recommend a plan known as the "Townsend old-age revolving-pension plan", tending toward the accomplishment of these aims and the security of persons of this State in their old age; and

Whereas it is imperative that our younger people may find employment and thus put an end in a large measure to our present unemployment situation, and that the active and wide-spread buying and selling to result from the operation of the Townsend bill will help banish poverty and bring back prosperity to our country in general: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate of this twenty-fourth legislative assembly (the house of representatives concurring herein), That the Congress of the United States is hereby respectfully memorialized and urged to give every consideration to the said "the Townsend old-age revolving pension plan" if, as, and when the same is presented for its consideration; be it further

Resolved, That the Senators and Representatives of the State of North Dakota in the Congress of the United States be requested to take such necessary steps as will insure full consideration of the aforesaid "the Townsend old-age revolving pension plan" upon its presentation to the Congress of the United States, and that copies of this memorial be forwarded forthwith to the President of the Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to the Senators and Representatives of the State of North Dakota.

A. S. MARSHALL,
President pro tempore of the Senate.
F. E. TUNELL,
Secretary of the Senate.
WILLIAM M. CROCKETT,
Speaker of the House.
WALTER S. MARTIN,
Chief Clerk of the House.

Concurrent Resolution D

Memorializing the Congress of the United States to act favorably, and with as much speed as possible, upon House Joint Resolution No. 66, providing for a constitutional amendment doing away with the issuance of tax-exempt bonds

Whereas there is now pending in the Congress of the United States of America, House Joint Resolution No. 66, which provides for a constitutional amendment doing away with the tax-exempt feature of further issues of Federal, State, and municipal bonds; and

Whereas it is represented that the outstanding issues of tax-exempt securities in the United States aggregate the sum of $50,000,000,000, and it is impossible for this Government to continue unless the loss of such revenue be eliminated: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the Twenty-fourth Legislative Assembly of the State of North Dakota, assembled in its regular biennial session, That the citizens of North Dakota, through its legislative members call upon and urge all Members of the Congress of the United States, and particularly the Members representing the State of North Dakota, to use every honest and honorable means within their power to pass said resolution as speedily as possible, in order to prevent the issuance of tax-exempt securities in the future; be it further

Resolved, That we urge upon the Members of said Congress to take the necessary steps to retire, as speedily as possible, all outstanding tax-exempt bonds and replace them with United States bonds which shall be subject to the use and customary taxation.

A. S. MARSHALL,
President pro tempore of the Senate.
F. E. TUNELL,
Secretary of the Senate.
WILLIAM M. CROCKETT,
Speaker of the House.
WALTER S. MARTIN,
Chief Clerk of the House.

Senate Concurrent Resolution H

Requesting Congress of the United States to enact legislation to provide for the immediate payment of World War veterans' adjusted-compensation certificates, canceling interest, refunding interest paid.

Be it resolved by the Senate of the State of North Dakota (the house of representatives concurring):

Whereas a general economic depression producing a depreciation in the value of all commodities, a stagnation of business, an aggravated condition of unemployment and serious individual suffering now exists in the State of North Dakota and throughout the whole Nation; and

Whereas there are now pending before the Congress of the United States certain measures, the purpose of which is to alleviate in some degree the existing distressing conditions, by providing for the immediate conversion into cash of World War veterans' adjusted-compensation certificates; and

Whereas the passage of such legislation would bring immediate relief to thousands of veterans and their dependents who are now in need, create new markets, instill new life into American business, and be a well-deserved demonstration of the gratitude of the Nation to those who carried its arms in 1917 and 1918; and

Whereas the American Legion in convention duly assembled have requested the immediate cash payment of all adjusted-compensation certificates; and

Whereas it is our sincere and honest belief that the immediate cash payment of all adjusted-compensation certificates will be of untold value in hastening recovery from present economic crisis: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate of the State of North Dakota, the House of Representatives concurring, most respectfully urge upon the Congress of the United States the early enactment of legislation providing for the cancellation of all accrued interest, the refund of all interest paid, and the immediate payment, upon application, of the full face value of such adjusted-compensation certificates; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of North Dakota be, and he is hereby, instructed to forward a duly authenticated copy of this resolution to the President of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to each Representative of the State of North Dakota in the United States Senate and House of Representatives.

WALTER WELFORD,
President of the Senate.
F. E. TUNELL,
Secretary of the Senate.
WILLIAM M. CROCKETT,
Speaker of the House.
WALTER S. MARTIN,
Chief Clerk of the House.

Mr. NYE also presented the following concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Senate Concurrent Resolution G

Whereas the International Peace Garden has been established on the boundary line between North Dakota and Manitoba; and

Whereas it is proper and necessary in order to complete said Peace Garden project, and to encourage and attract traffic to the same, and to increase an interest in such project, that adequate customs and immigration buildings in keeping and in harmony with the character and nature of said Peace Garden project be constructed and erected thereon: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislative Assembly of the State of North Dakota, That the bill in Congress introduced by Senator GERALD P. NYE, which provides for adequate customs and immigration buildings upon said project be, and the same is hereby, approved and endorsed, and that Congress be petitioned and requested to pass the same.

A. S. MARSHALL,
President pro tempore of the Senate.
F. E. TUNELL,
Secretary of the Senate.
WILLIAM M. CROCKETT,
Speaker of the House.
WALTER S. MARTIN,
Chief Clerk of the House.

Mr. NYE also presented the following joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, which was ordered to lie on the table:

Joint Resolution B

Be it enacted by the legislative Assembly of the State of North Dakota—

Whereas during the past 2 years the Federal Government has set apart and given to the State of North Dakota outright grants of large sums of money to be used to relieve the needy and destitute citizens of the State; and

Whereas the persons needing the relief obtained through these grants were in the position of need through no fault of their own, but rather through conditions developing as a result of the combination of national and international economic disaster with local drought conditions; and

Whereas serious need continues through failure of improvement in economic conditions together with a continuance of drought; and

Whereas it now appears that the tax-collecting power of the State is in grave danger of complete failure because of the inability of farm, home, and industrial property to meet the demands made upon them; and

Whereas the development of this condition prevents the possibility of the State making increased levies to meet the demands for relief needs until revision of the State constitution can be effected, and which will require 2 years time: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislative Assembly of the State of North Dakota, duly convened, That a memorial be served upon the Congress of the United States, and upon His Excellency, the President of the United States, and upon Harold L. Ickes, Secretary of the Interior, and upon Harry L. Hopkins, Federal Emergency Relief Administrator, to the end that full grants of Federal funds to meet the relief needs of the State may be continued as in the past; and be it further

Resolved, That certified copies of this joint resolution be forwarded by the Governor of this State to the President of the United States, to the President of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to the Members of the North Dakota delegation in Congress.

WALTER WELFORD,
President of the Senate.
F. E. TUNELL,
Secretary of the Senate.
WILLIAM M. CROCKETT,
Speaker of the House.
WALTER S. MARTIN,
Chief Clerk of the House.

Mr. NYE also presented the following concurrent resolutions of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, which were ordered to lie on the table:

House Concurrent Resolution A–11

Memorializing Congress to enact legislation to provide funds to assist in hospitalization and care of the sick

Be it resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring)—

Whereas the hospitals of this State are unable to meet the demands made upon them for proper care and treatment of the sick, due to the shortage of funds caused by the severe drought and failure of crops during the year 1934 over an area comprising more than three-fourths of this State; and

Whereas this condition will continue to exist for several months, or until another crop is produced, and that there is no other available source from which to receive sufficient funds; and

Whereas the Federal relief set-up does not provide for hospitalization or care of the sick: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we urge upon the Congress of the United States the enactment of all necessary legislation to provide means for relieving this and similar emergencies; be it further

Resolved, That copies hereof be mailed to President Roosevelt, to the Vice President, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to Congressmen WILLIAM LEMKE and U. L. BURDICK and to Senators LYNN J. FRAZIER and GERALD P. NYE.

WILLIAM M. CROCKETT,
Speaker of the House.
WALTER S. MARTIN,
Chief Clerk of the House.
A. S. MARSHALL,
President pro tempore of the Senate.
F. E. TUNELL,
Secretary of the Senate.

Concurrent Resolution C

Whereas the Secretary of Agriculture, under the authorization contained in the Hayden-Cartwright Act of June 18, 1934, has apportioned Federal aid to the several States for use in highway construction in the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1935, which funds are apportioned upon the old policy of matching by the States; and

Whereas the financial situation of North Dakota is such that it will not be able to match such Federal aid and to take advantage of such apportionment; and

Whereas it is unfair and unjust that our State should be penalized by reason of its existing financial condition for which it is in no wise to blame and cannot remedy at this time: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of North Dakota (the house of Representatives concurring), That action should be taken by

allotment of Federal moneys, if possible or by legislation by Congress, if necessary, to make available to North Dakota and to other States which may be similarly situated, Federal funds which may be used to match such funds as have been apportioned as herein set forth; be it further

Resolved, That copies hereof shall be sent by the secretary of the senate to each of our congressional delegation and to the Governors of Kansas, Nebraska, Iowa, Minnesota, South Dakota, and Montana.

WALTER WELFORD,
President of the Senate.
F. E. TUNELL,
Secretary of the Senate.
WILLIAM M. CROCKETT,
Speaker of the House.
WALTER S. MARTIN,
Chief Clerk of the House.

Senate Concurrent Resolution U

Whereas during the past years the Federal Government has made loans to the farmers of this State to aid them in the purchase of seed with which to plant their crops and has taken security for such loans in the form of notes secured by crop mortgages; and

Whereas by reason of the continued drought conditions existing in this State and the continuance of the depression which has so adversely affected agriculture, it has been absolutely impossible for our farmers to liquidate but a very small portion, if any, of such indebtedness; and

Whereas it will be necessary for our farmers to receive further aid from the Federal Government during the year 1935 to enable them to purchase and obtain the seed necessary to plant their crops: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of North Dakota, the house of representatives concurring, That we urge our Representatives in Congress to do everything possible to bring about the passage of legislation by Congress or the issuance of such Executive order as may be necessary to obtain for our farmers the seed which will be required to plant their crops during 1935, but without any requirement that payment shall be made or security required or given on account of any prior indebtedness to the Government for seed sold and furnished in prior years, and further urge that the sale and delivery of seed for the year 1935 be made immediately so as to make seed available at once.

A. S. MARSHALL,
President pro tempore of the Senate.
F. E. TUNELL,
Secretary of the Senate.
WILLIAM M. CROCKETT,
Speaker of the House.
WALTER S. MARTIN,
Chief Clerk of the House.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. ADAMS, from the Committee on Appropriations, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 6644) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1935, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1935, and for other purposes, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 338) thereon.

Mr. SHEPPARD, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 1713) to further amend section 6, act of March 4, 1923, so as to make better provision for the recovery and disposition of bodies of members of the civilian components of the Army who die in line of duty, and for other purposes, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 336) thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (S. 1840) authorizing the President of the United States to present in the name of Congress a medal of honor to Maj. Gen. Adolphus Washington Greely, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 337) thereon.

Mr. BARBOUR, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 164) for the relief of Donald L. Bruner, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 341) thereon.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 1885) to authorize turning over to the Indian Service vehicles, vessels, and supplies seized and forfeited for violation of liquor laws, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 339) thereon.

Mr. VAN NUYS, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (S. 24) to assure to persons within the jurisdiction of every State the equal protection of the laws by discouraging, preventing, and punishing the crime of lynching, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 340) thereon.

Mr. BURKE, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which were referred the following bills, reported them each without amendment:

S. 1452. A bill providing for the employment of skilled shorthand reporters in the executive branch of the Government; and

S. 1453. A bill to create a board of shorthand reporting, and for other purposes.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. TYDINGS:

A bill (S. 2277) to provide for the payment of veterans' adjusted-service certificates in bonds of the United States; to the Committee on Finance.

A bill (S. 2278) authorizing the construction of buildings for the United States High Commissioner to the government of the Commonwealth of the Philippine Islands; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

(By request.) A bill (S. 2279) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Civil Service.

By Mr. STEIWER:

A bill (S. 2280) to authorize preliminary examination and survey of the Columbia River at Rainier, Oreg.; to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 2281) authorizing the establishment of a revolving fund for the Klamath Indians, Oregon; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. HATCH:

A bill (S. 2282) to provide for payments to certain property owners in New Mexico for losses caused by the floods in the Rio Grande Valley during 1929; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HATCH and Mr. THOMAS of Utah:

A bill (S. 2283) authorizing the appointment of a commissioner for the United States Court for China and defining his duties; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LOGAN:

A bill (S. 2284) to amend the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933 by including the Cumberland River and its basin within the provisions of the act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. BARBOUR:

A bill (S. 2285) to divest prize-fight films of their character as subjects of interstate or foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY:

A bill (S. 2286) providing for the allocation of net revenues of the Shoshone power plant of the Shoshone reclamation project in Wyoming; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. TRAMMELL:

A bill (S. 2287) to authorize the crediting of service rendered by personnel (active or retired) subsequently to June 30, 1932, in the computation of their active or retired pay after June 30, 1935; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE] is unavoidably detained from the Senate on official business. At his request, I ask unanimous consent out of order to introduce, in his name, a bill for appropriate reference.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred.

By Mr. CLARK (for Mr. GORE):

A bill (S. 2288) to provide for the measurement of vessels using the Panama Canal, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interoceanic Canals.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

A bill (S. 2289) to establish the Kings Canyon National Park, Calif., to transfer thereto the lands now included in the General Grant National Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. BONE:

A bill (S. 2290) for the relief of F. A. Hoffman; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 2291) for the relief of Joseph W. Atkinson; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (S. 2292) for the relief of Emanuel Wallin; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

(By request.) A bill (S. 2293) for the retirement of employees of the Alaska Railroad, Territory of Alaska, who are citizens of the United States; to the Committee on Civil Service.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

A bill (S. 2294) to authorize the erection of a suitable statue of Maj. Gen. George W. Goethals within the Canal Zone; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PITTMAN:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 86) authorizing an annual appropriation of $10,000 to enable the United States to become a member of the Pan American Institute of Geography and History; authorizing the President to invite the institute to hold its second general assembly in the United States in 1935, and authorizing appropriation of $10,000 for expenses of such meeting; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

PAYMENT OF ADJUSTED-SERVICE CERTIFICATES

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, a few days ago I introduced, together with one of the Representatives from New York State, a bill dealing with the adjusted-service certificates. I have reintroduced the bill today (Senate bill 2277), after conferring with Veterans' Bureau officials to correct some, perhaps, imperfections in the original draft; and I have asked them for a statement of just what the bill will do. Attached to the statement is a tabular explanation of what will now happen, under the bill, to a veteran whose adjusted-service certificate would be worth $1,000 in 1945.

I ask that at the conclusion of these brief remarks an explanation prepared by the Veterans' Bureau, with the attached table, be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

PROPOSED MEASURE OF SENATOR TYDINGS

This bill is entitled "A bill to provide for the payment of veterans' adjusted-service certificates in bonds of the United States." It provides for amending section 507 of the World War Adjusted Compensation Act, as amended, and for the addition of a new section to title V of the World War Adjusted Compensation Act, as amended, to be known as "section 509."

The amendment to section 507 of the existing act provides for the expenditure of all amounts in the fund for the purposes of the proposed act.

The benefits under this bill may be secured by a certificate holder by filing an application with the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, and the surrender to the Administrator of the adjusted-service certificate and all rights thereunder. Settlement of the amount due under the provisions of this measure shall be made to the veteran or his authorized representative if the veteran be incompetent and to the estate of the veteran if the veteran dies after application has been filed.

When the application and certificates are in the possession of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs he shall discount, at true discount, the amount shown as the maturity value on the face of the certificate surrendered from January 1, 1945, at the rate of interest of 3 percent per annum, compounded semiannually, to the first day of January or July, whichever is the earlier date, next succeeding the date of the filing of the application with the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. From the present value of the maturity value shown on the face of the certificate, determined by the deduction therefrom of the amount of true discount, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall deduct the amount of lien, if any, outstanding against the certificate with interest, if any, accrued to the date of the filing of the application for benfits under this act. On and after January 1, 1932, the amount of interest charged on loans shall be 3 percent per annum, compounded annually.

The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall certify to the Secretary of the Treasury, upon a form to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, a statement of the amount due each veteran. Upon receipt of this statement the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to issue in settlement of the amount certified to be due negotiable bonds of the United States, with coupons attached, bearing interest at the rate of 3 percent per annum, payable semiannually, in a value equal to the highest multiple of $50 represented by the amount certified. The difference between the net amount certified as due and the amount represented by the face value of bonds issued shall be paid to the veteran by the Secretary of the Treasury by check drawn upon the Treasurer of the United States.

The bonds issued shall be redeemable in lawful money of the United States on January 1, 1945. The bonds shall be dated from the 1st day of January or July (whichever is the earlier date) next succeeding the date of the filing with the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs of an application for benefits under the provisions of this act. Veterans to whom bonds have been issued are protected from exploitation by a provision in section 509 (h) of the act which prevents the negotiability of the bonds for 6 months after the date of issue for any consideration less than the amount shown on the face of the bond as the redemption value. Violation of this provision of the law is made a fraud and punishment is prescribed of a fine of not more than $10,000 or imprisonment of not more than 2 years, or both.

The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to redeem from the United States Government Life Insurance Fund all adjusted-service certificates held by that fund on account of loans made thereon and to pay to the United States Government Life Insurance Fund the amount of outstanding liens against such certificates, including all interest due or accrued, together with such amounts as may be due under subdivision (m) of section 502, as amended. The Secretary of the Treasury, in making redemption of adjusted-service certificates from the United States Government Life Insurance Fund, is authorized and directed to make payment therefor by issuing to the United States Government Life Insurance Fund bonds of the United States, which shall bear interest at the rate of 4½ percent per annum, to be callable at a date not earlier than 10 years subsequent to the date of issue.

MARCH 18, 1935.

Approximate settlement to holder of $1,000 adjusted-service certificate not pledged as security for loan

Certificate having maturity value on Jan. 1, 1945, of	$1,000.00
Present value of maturity value of $1,000 certificate discounted (at true discount) at the rate of 3 percent per annum compounded semiannually from Jan. 1, 1945, to July 1, 1935	753.61
Settlement to veteran in cash as of July 1, 1935	3.61
Settlement to veteran in bond issue as of July 1, 1935, convertible into cash	750.00
Interest on $750 bond for 9½ years at 3 percent per annum	213.75

MARCH 18, 1935.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

H. R. 6718. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and for the Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

AMENDMENT TO HOME-MORTGAGE RELIEF BILL

Mr. BANKHEAD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 6021) to provide additional home-mortgage relief, to amend the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, and the National Housing Act, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT TO AGRICULTURAL DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. BILBO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 6718, the Agriculture Department appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed, as follows:

On page 50, line 6, to strike out "$61,741" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "including investigation of the consumption, properties, components, and products of such naval stores, the modification and improvement, adaptation to consumption needs, and development and expansion of new and established uses of the same, $81,741."

WORK-RELIEF PROGRAM—AMENDMENTS

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask permission to submit an amendment intended to be proposed by me to House Joint Resolution 117, making appropriations for relief purposes, to have it read by the clerk, and lie on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment of the Senator from Virginia will be received, read, and lie on the table.

The amendment was read, as follows:

On page 3, line 25, after the word "resolution", to insert a colon and the following: "*Provided further*, That no part of the funds herein appropriated shall be expended for the administrative expenses of any department, bureau, board, commission, or independent agency of the Government if such administrative expenses are ordinarily financed from annual appropriations."

Mr. BANKHEAD and Mr. CUTTING each submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, respectively, to

the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 117) making appropriations for relief purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Indian Affairs be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 1456) to compensate the heirs of James Taylor, a deceased Cherokee Indian, for all their title, interest, or claim to certain lands in the State of North Carolina, now held by the United States as a part of the forest reserve, and for other purposes; that it be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. This request is made at the instance of the two departments having jurisdiction of the subject matter.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE N. R. A.—EDITORIAL FROM CHICAGO DAILY NEWS

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I ask to have the following editorial from the Chicago Daily News printed in the RECORD. I am glad to associate myself with most of the irrefutable conclusions herein expressed.

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

[From the Chicago Daily News, Mar. 16, 1935]

THE COLLAPSE OF THE N. R. A.

On June 16, 1933, the N. R. A. was born "to increase production and consumption" and "to relieve unemployment."

On June 16, 1935, it will expire, having utterly failed to achieve either of these two major purposes.

Did N. R. A. increase production and consumption?

The Federal Reserve Board index of industrial production in June 1933 stood at 91 percent of the average of 1923–25. The same index for December 1934 showed production at 78 percent of the 1923–25 average. The index figures for consumption show department-stores sales for June 1933 at 68 percent of the 1923–25 average, while the sales for December 1934 were 76 percent. But, in the meantime, between June 1933 and December 1934 there had been an increase in the average price index of 18.5 percent, which would indicate an actual loss in unit sales—this, despite the fact that the Government's expenditures for relief had risen from a monthly average of $66,064,000 in 1933 to $123,278,000 in 1934, an increase of 87 percent.

Did N. R. A. increase employment, its other major objective?

In June 1933 the number of unemployed was estimated at 12 millions. The total number of unemployed is now announced to be in the neighborhood of 13 millions.

The number of people on relief in July 1933—the first month for which there are reliable Federal figures and the first month of the N. R. A.—was 15,282,000. On March 6 of this year it was announced that the number on relief was 22,350,000.

The average hourly wage paid under N. R. A. codes has increased somewhat, but the number of hours of employment per week to the average worker has decreased so that the content of many workers' pay envolops has gone down. An additional handicap to labor has been the higher prices which have been exacted for factory products due to N. R. A., and for food, the cost of which, due to the wide-spread drought and the operation of the A. A. A., shows an increase of 18 percent.

Who, then, has gained under the operation of the N. R. A.?

The cooperation of industry in the creation of the N. R. A. was purchased at the price of Government relaxation of the anti-monopoly laws. The leaders of industry were induced to support the N. R. A. by promises of price-fixing agreements, the establishment of restraints upon free competition, and the subjection of each industry to control by a privately organized code authority, in most instances named and dominated by the larger units of the industry. In other words, in order to try the experiment of a regimented industry under Government control, the Roosevelt administration consented to permit monopolistic practices hitherto forbidden.

What was the result?

Standard Statistics, Inc., the authority on business statistics, reports that 70 industrial companies analyzed by it showed, in 1933, a 291 percent net gain in profits on an expansion of only 1.4 percent in gross sales. In 1934—the first full year under N. R. A.—these same companies realized a further increase of 27.4 percent in net profits over those of 1933, on a gain of 21.5 percent in sales. The National City Bank, in a recent report, declared that 840 corporations, including many of the largest in the country, made net profits in 1933 of $471,203,000, and that the net profits of the same corporations in 1934—the first full year under N. R. A.—jumped to $673,259,000.

Summarized, this then is the result of 2 years under the N. R. A.—2 years of the Government's partnership in business secured through relaxation of the antimonopoly laws:

1. A decrease in industrial production.
2. No increase in consumption when price increases are taken into consideration, and despite the doubling of the Government's monthly expenditures for relief.
3. An estimated decrease in employment and a 47 percent increase in the number on relief.
4. An actual loss in real wages, due mainly to an 18-percent increase in food costs.
5. A 291-percent net gain in profits for 70 of the largest industrial companies of the country in 1933, and a further gain of 27 percent in profits for the same companies in 1934.
6. An increase of over $200,000,000 in the net profits of 840 corporations in 1934 over 1933.

Among the first to denounce the N. R. A. as an instrumentality to legalize monopoly, the Daily News finds in its complete collapse a sense of regret, supplemented by a feeling of alarm. Our alarm arises out of fear that popular resentment will consign the entire project to oblivion, whereas a small portion of the act should be preserved. More than a year ago, on February 15, 1934, we said:

"The N. R. A., as a means of economic recovery, probably will be retained in two distinct classes of industry. Public opinion will demand its retention in industries which for years have been characterized by sweatshop conditions, in industries where children have been employed, and in industries which deal with natural resources, such as oil, iron ore, lumber, and coal. In all of those industries there is a definite public interest, and Federal control, in order to prevent indefensible exploitation of labor, or material, may be defended upon the ground of common welfare."

That opinion is still maintained, and we hope that out of the discussion now in progress in Congress will come a revision of the N. R. A., which will preserve the desirable features and relegate the balance of the costly and ill-conceived experiment to the growing limbo of new-deal failures.

INTERNATIONAL EXCHANGE OF IDEAS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a radio address delivered in New York City on March 10, by the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS].

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

This evening I have been the guest of Dr. Harry Edmonds of the International House at Columbia University. It has been my pleasure to talk to scores of students from the four corners of the globe, who now are residents of this country for purposes of study. Such an experience would be an inspiring opportunity for anyone, and I have thrilled under it. Because I am by long training a school man, a student, and therefore a believer in ideas, I see more lasting progress to the world and its people through an exchange of ideas than through any other single medium, and an exchange of students offers a splended forum for the exchange of ideas. The International House lends itself splendidly to an exchange of students and of ideas.

Ignorance, man's greatest enemy, cannot persist if enough open discussion is indulged in. Despite the fact that ignorance will take its place as part of a discussion, in any discussion truth ultimately will find a way to prevail. Were it otherwise, parliamentary bodies would be useless. Discussion is essential to any social life. It is definitely essential to government. Not only is statute enacted by legislation the byproduct of talk, but also the laws of custom are byproducts of talk. Seriously, civilized man goes forward only after discussion, planning, and organization. The basis of all is understanding, and the basis of all understanding is, after all, talk. An example may be found even in the dissenting opinions of jurists. Such opinions without study might seem to be useless verbiage, yet in fact they wield a mighty force in the development of the law.

It is this belief I have in the effectiveness of discussion, and interchange of ideas, which makes me interested in a lasting arrangement for an exchange of teachers and students in our international world. Such an exchange of students will lead to scholarly discussion which in turn will break down the barrier of intolerance and prejudice and lead to an appreciation of differing opinions. Through appreciation, nations may be given to common aims. An average internationalist assumes that it would be well for the world if nations were alike. That idea I do not accept. Nations need not be alike. In fact it is well that they be not alike, for the world is made better through independent and various developments than through a common development. This holds for both individuals and nations. What we want to attain is a break-down of hate and ignorance through a development of the spirit of appreciation. No worth-while civilization and no worth-while State, and we may even say no worth-while culture, can be built on hate and ignorance.

It is partly for this reason that I suggested the creation in our State Department, and now suggest for its acceptance in the similar departments of other nations, of an intellectual attaché to serve along with our military, commercial, and naval attachés. This division of activity as proposed, would assist in a substantial exchange of instructors and students, and carry on through regular channels, an exchange of new ideas; new ideas relating to the effectiveness of new educational and cultural development. In other words, besides taking official notice of the progress of other countries in military, naval, and commercial sciences, I propose that we cultivate the knowledge of the development of good will, education, and truth. It may be said that art, culture, and truth know no boundaries; neither, then, do the ideas behind military

and commercial advancement. But at present one grows by encouragement; the other must wait for its own growth.

When we analyze the differences which arise between men or States, we discover generally these differences lie in a conflict over words or ideas. To have differences of opinion is natural, and is necessary, for no two men can see anything alike. Therefore, similar stimuli cannot be found on which to find exact concepts. A concept after all has its basis in the imagination. In the political or governmental world three men may be discussing a given proposition. One states that he is a monarchist and that he accepts the theory of hereditary government. Another states that he favors a dictatorship, on the ground that there must be a unity in the state, and a dictatorship furnishes the only possibility for the realization of a single will in the state. The third may advocate the theory of democracy, maintaining that there may be many wills in the state, but that the single will is obtained by a decision of the many to agree as one. Now so long as the three men confine themselves to a discussion, and the expression of opinions, they remain in what may be termed the "academic sphere", and no harm is done, but when they fight over their differences, one trying to force his opinion upon the others, their fight is seen as being over not actualities but unreal things. Hence the pen is said to be mightier than the sword, and that was truly said, because it is only in the realm of the idea that the ideal and the perfect may be found. After the conflict, disillusionment sets in, because that which remains is not unreal, but real, while the subject matter which induced the conflict remains only in the realm of imaginations. In other words, that which was fought for remains unrealized. Yet as a result of such conflict many of the ideals taken from the realm of the imagination are found to have modified the actual; therefore, the importance of having proper ideals and concepts. Man truly does not live by bread alone. If he does, he is not a man but a mere being. Creatures are turned into men by projection of the imagination and extension of the mind. It is well that men live in harmony with the infinite past, and are not prevented from projecting themselves into the endless future. Thus, the minute that men fight over ideas they destroy the possibility for their full growth. Wars, therefore, even for principle, have retarded men's striving for the universal, the eternal, and the perfect.

Today's papers tell us of mighty clashes in two of the great nations of the earth, where there is a conflict of idea, which may end in resorting to the sword. The fundamental theory behind the Hitler regime in Germany is based upon the notion of a single will in the State. German churchmen say that this cannot be, because the single will must remain with God. As long as this remains a clash of opinions only, no harm will be done, for the State can be run under either theory. But if there is a force of arms, no good is accomplished, because after a forcible conflict, both theories still will remain, even though the champions of one may be dominant. The two forces may, on the other hand, destroy each other, and the representatives of a third theory may take their places. Still, all three theories would live, for theories are never real and are therefore never destroyed and never die.

In Japan the underlying concept of the Japanese constitution has been and is that the Emperor is in the lineage of the gods; that his body is inviolate; and that in his will rest all rights and privileges of the Japanese people. Now comes someone who suggests that the Emperor is a mere organ of the State or of the constitution, not a superindividual or a divine human being. The Japanese people attempt to keep their language logical with their political theory. Look for a Japanese interpretation of the expression, "the Emperor dies", for example. It will not be found; because of their political theory, the Japanese express themselves with the equivalent of "the Emperor takes himself away" or "the imperial household augustly mourns", for of course a supernatural being could not die.

In the discussions in Tokyo over the question as to whether the Army and the Navy should be called upon to enforce the idea that the Emperor is divine and to erase any idea that he is a mere organ of the constitution, it was held by the leaders of the Army and the Navy that such was not their duty, the implication being that the destruction of theories was not part of the military service; that armies and navies should deal with facts and actualities. Wisely the promulgation of the theories of the state were left to the education department, and to the education department is left the treatment of this conflict in imperial theory.

The present German regime would do well to follow the Japanese example. Americans who know their Constitution know how basic to our American life is the first amendment to the Constitution. They know that the enforcement of ideas, opinions, theories, and all concepts which are concerned with the projection of men's minds into the realm of the infinite and the universal must not be left to the Army, the Navy, and the police to enforce. It is this great fact which makes the Government of the United States a government of men. May it never become a place where mere beings exist. "We, the people of these United States", means "we, the men, the women, and the children of these United States", and not "we, a human mass, living in the United States."

In America, before the law, men are equal. That does not mean, even in a political sense, that they are identical, and no two men have exact economic and social equality. But all are equal in their rights to aspire, in their ambitions to achieve, in their wills to think. They may come, they may go, they may do, they may worship, by making their souls one with whatever form of the Infinite they wish. This, after all, is America's glory. Let us preserve it as an American fact.

EDITORIALS AND NEWSPAPER ITEMS ON THE DEPRESSION

Mr. MINTON. Mr. President, I ask permission to have printed in the RECORD a number of newspaper editorials and items in answer to remarks made in the Senate and elsewhere to the effect that we are not emerging from the depression. These clippings, furnishing evidence to the contrary, are selected at random from newspapers all over the United States.

There being no objection, the editorials and newspaper items referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Hammond (Ind.) Times, Mar. 1, 1935]

CHEERFUL NEWS

Perhaps no more cheerful news has come out of the Calumet district since the boom days of 1929 than the survey of the Hammond Times yesterday in which a $30,000,000 building program for the region was outlined.

The fact that the 11 projects listed in the program are definitely scheduled for construction this year gives the announcement a note of authority not contained in any similar survey of the last 6 years.

Included in the list are such projects as the $17,000,000 expansion and modernization program for the Gary works of the Illinois Steel Co., a new $1,000,000 mill for the Inland Steel Co. at Indiana Harbor, a $3,000,000 waterway development project for the Illinois side of the State line, Hammond's $700,000 filtration plant, Calumet City's $600,000 high-school building, its $120,000 post office, the Electro-Motive Corporation's new $5,000,000 plant, a highway program in Lake County costing $1,000,000, and a $1,100,000 bridge north of Calumet City over the Calumet River at Torrence Avenue.

Building-construction men can afford to rub their hands in glee over the size of the entire program, for they have had little to make them happy since the stock market crashed in 1929.

Literally thousands of building-trades men will find employment now. Other thousands will be needed to produce the materials and deliver them. Business establishments will reflect the boom in increased sales. And the entire community will be benefited proportionately.

The nature of the program recalls the easy-money days of 1928 and 1929, when building projects running into box-car figures were the rule. We became so used to such announcements then that a mere $10,000,000 expenditure did not impress us. But what a drought has held us in its grip since then.

For the region to come back with such a resounding bang this year is a good indication of what to expect in the next few years. It means that the pendulum has started to swing in the other direction. The Calumet district, long recognized as the workshop of America, now will continue the phenomenal development which made it one of the principal industrial centers in the world.

This does not take into calculation what will happen if the five-billion bill goes through in Congress.

[From the Los Angeles Times, Mar. 4, 1935]

CALIFORNIA ON UPGRADE—TRADE STATISTICS ENCOURAGING—EMPLOYMENT, PAY ROLLS, OIL PRODUCTION, AND BANK DEBITS ADVANCE

Business continues to improve in California.

Information released yesterday by the State chamber of commerce shows increases in employment and pay rolls, the output of crude oil, the value of building permits, and bank debits.

At the same time it was disclosed that agricultural districts of the State have benefited by the greater than normal rainfall of this season. Snowfall in the mountains, heavier than usual, promises plenty of water for summer crops. Green food for livestock is abundant, the report continues.

PRICES ADVANCE

An index of prices paid to growers in California for 24 farm products advanced 8.9 percent from December to January and was 16.2 percent higher than in the same period a year ago. Prices of meat animals, dairy products, poultry products, and some fruit crops, however, showed a slight recession, the survey disclosed.

A gain of 2.5 percent in employment in California manufacturing establishments was recorded from December to January, while there was a total pay-roll gain of 7.9 percent at the same time, the statement showed. Groups showing increases included chemicals, oils, printing and paper, clothing, laundering, metals, machinery, and wood manufactures.

EMPLOYMENT LARGER

When compared with January a year ago, employment during January this year was 7.8 percent greater, and the total pay roll 18.3 percent greater. Among the various groups, all except foods showed from 3.4 to 17.2 percent more employment during January 1935 than in the same month last year.

Total value of building permits for 51 California cities during January registered a gain of 40 percent over the previous month. When compared with January a year ago, value of permits for Los Angeles advanced 123.2 percent, San Francisco 85.3 percent, and other cities showed a lesser gain.

SALES SHOW GAINS

During January the total value of sales of department stores showed a decrease of 5.1 percent, following the Christmas buying in December. However, sales as a whole were 8.7 percent greater in January this year than in the same period of 1934.

Total value of bank debits for 14 California cities during January was $1,722,572,000, or 6.8 percent greater than in January last year.

[From the Gary (Ind.) Post-Tribune, Mar. 1, 1935]

BANK CLEARINGS FOR FEBRUARY FAR ABOVE LAST YEAR'S FIGURE

Bank clearings aggregating $2,633,050 more than the total for February 1934 were reported today by Gary's two operating banks for last month.

The February total for the two institutions was $8,665,535, compared to $9,701,259 for January. The recession of $1,035,724 was ascribed to the fact that February was a short month. Bank officials predicted a marked pickup during March.

The Gary State Bank's February clearings of $7,355,943 fell short $1,262,756 of reaching the January mark of $8,618,699.

The Gary Trust and Savings Bank reported $1,309,592 for February, compared to $1,082,560 for the previous month, a gain of $227,032.

The 1934 February totals for the two banks were: Gary State, $5,605,230, and Gary Trust, $427,255; the aggregate being $6,032,485.

The Gary Trust's gain over February of last year was $882,337, or nearly 60 percent.

Last month's total for the two banks was only about $900,000 shy of the December aggregate, which marked the peak for 1934.

[From the Tampa (Fla.) Tribune, Mar. 4, 1935]

THE RECORD OF RECOVERY

We are indebted to the State chamber of commerce for definite and succinct facts and figures of Florida's recovery. We brief the outstanding figures, the percentages of increase stated being for 1934 over 1933.

Retail trade, 26.3 percent.
Fertilizer consumption, 18.8 percent.
Electric-power production, 9.4.
Life-insurance premiums, 24.6.
Building contracts, 47.8.
Passenger motor-car purchases, 49.1.
Truck purchases, 92.2.
Automobile tags, 18.8.
Gasoline consumption, 14.5.
Value of fruit, vegetable, and general crops, 34.5.
Value of citrus crop, 30.
Vegetable crop, 43.9.
Value of exports, 15.
Value of imports, 15.8.

The only important item in which there was a decrease was the motor-vehicle tax, and this was due not to any slump in the demand but to the lower rates.

The percentage figures are eloquent in themselves. They tell of a steady and sure restoration of business activity, of industrial production, of tourist travel, of generally better conditions.

[From the South Bend (Ind.) News-Times, Mar. 1, 1935]

FARM MACHINE TRADE HEAVIER—LANIGAN SAYS TWO-PLOW TRACTORS EXCEEDING PRESENT SUPPLY

LA PORTE, IND., March 1 (Special).—Favorable reports on the 1935 outlook in the agricultural machine line were brought by territory salesmen of the La Porte branch of the Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co. at a sales meeting here.

The salesmen, with districts in Indiana and Michigan, are enthusiastic over prospects for increased use of tractors, combines, and threshers, which the firm manufactures here. E. D. Lanigan, branch manager said:

"Already the demand for two-plow tractors has surpassed the available supply. Production in these lines is being stepped up and is expected shortly to more nearly equalize the demand."

Among those present at the conference was B. G. Baker of Milwaukee, Wis., eastern division sales manager.

The La Porte branch of the Allis-Chalmers Co. formerly was the Advance-Rumely Co.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, Mar. 11, 1935]

UNITED STATES AND BETHLEHEM STEEL SHOW SHARP EXPANSION IN SALES—1934 VOLUME OF BOTH COMPANIES ENLARGES OPERATING RETURNS

Two leading steel combines—the United States Steel and the Bethlehem Steel Corporations—issued their 1934 annual reports last night. Results of the respective companies differed widely over the term, the United States Steel incurring a total deficit of $28,873,401 last year, whereas Bethlehem had a net income of $550,571. In 1933 United States Steel reported a deficit for the year of $43,706,745. Over the like term Bethlehem reported a deficit of $8,735,723.

The improvement in net deficit of United States Steel in 1934, which was $14,833,343 better than the 1933 returns, was due in part to an increase in the shipment of finished products, reductions in costs arising from larger operations, and the cumulative effect of changes in methods and practices instituted in recent years and a moderate increase in selling prices, the report says.

SALES INCREASE

Total volume of business transacted by all companies in the United States Steel group aggregated $591,609,497 in 1934, an increase of $66,640,729 over 1933.

Total income of the Bethlehem Steel for 1934, after deducting all charges except depletion and depreciation, was $14,350,210, compared with $4,770,535 for the preceding year. After deducting provisions for depreciation and depletion of $13,779,639 net income of $550,571 resulted.

The net billed value of products shipped and of other classes of business done by the corporation during the year was $168,207,394, compared with $120,944,984 in 1933.

WESTINGHOUSE ELECTRIC

The annual report of the Westinghouse Electric & Manufacturing Co. for 1934 shows net income of $189,562, compared with a loss of $8,636,841 in the preceding year. The figures are after depreciation and reserves.

Orders received amounted to $106,473,226, against $72,473,117; unfilled orders at the end of the year amounted to $34,085,921.

AMERICAN SMELTING

The annual report of the American Smelting & Refining Co. and subsidiaries for 1934 shows net income of $7,583,202, after all charges, equal, after preferred dividend requirements, to $1.63 a share on the common stock. This compares with $6,010,383, or 77 cents a common share, in 1933.

MAYTAG

Net profit of $1,960,836 was reported for 1934 by the Maytag Co. The profit compares with net of $1,204,503 in 1933.

MONSANTO CHEMICAL

Monsanto Chemical Co. and subsidiaries for 1934 report net profit of $2,771,629.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Mar. 9, 1935]

RETAIL STORES REPORT SHARP GAINS IN TRADE—SALES INCREASE 4 TO 10 PERCENT, BUYING VOLUME 20 TO 25; WHOLESALE ORDERS RISE

Retail sales last week gained 4 to 10 percent over the corresponding week a year ago, despite the fact that the Easter buying season at this time last year was on the way to its peak, while this year the Easter stimulus will not be felt until early in April, Dun & Bradstreet reported yesterday in its weekly review of business. A larger volume of buying was noted last week than for several weeks, with gains of 20 to 25 percent recorded in some districts over the figures for 2 weeks ago.

The highest rate of gain over last year, 14 to 20 percent, was registered in the South and Southwest, where spring buying had a flying start because of fair weather. The rural districts of the Middle West were second with gains of 8 to 15 percent, and the Pacific coast areas followed with increases of 7 to 12 percent. New England and the East were held to gains of from 4 to 8 percent.

The upturn in wholesale buying was sharp and broad, the review stated, as retailers hastened to place their delayed orders for merchandise needed urgently for pre-Easter selling events. With orders postponed until a great deal of buying must be crowded into the next 4 weeks, some wholesalers were reported to be swamped as road salesmen started to send in business last week.

Orders for women's coats exceeded those placed for dresses and suits, it was said, thus reversing the trend of the 2 weeks preceding, and considerable interest was shown in the new fur capes to complement spring outfits. Men's clothing and furnishings were reported to be increasingly in demand, with the gains in orders by some houses 10 to 15 percent over those of a year ago.

General industrial operations are expanding more rapidly than in February, with no slowing down in sight, according to the review. New highs for the year are being reached for the production of automobiles, accessories, farm equipment, electric refrigerators, safety glass, paints, and some grades of furniture. Plumbing and heating equipment output is averaging about 20 percent ahead of the first quarter of 1934, and the percentage of aluminum production is constantly increasing over that of a year ago, the review reported.

The accelerated rate of retail sales in women's wear, millinery, hosiery, and shoes, it was said, indicate that sales totals for the comparative months of 1934 will be eclipsed by a wider percentage with each succeeding week until well into May. Retail sales of men's apparel gained last week, particularly in top coats, hats, shirts, and underwear, and the demand for both men's and women's shoes were reported to be continually expanding, with the trend toward higher qualities becoming greater.

Sales of groceries, helped by heavy buying of lenten specialties, made the best showing in more than a month. Housewares are beginning to move more briskly because of necessary spring cleaning, while sales of paints are running well ahead of last year. Curtains, floor coverings, draperies, awnings, leather goods, garden tools, and hardware sold well during the week, it was also reported.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 9, 1935]

MANUFACTURING CONTINUES GAIN—ACTIVITY UP 9.3 PERCENT IN JANUARY; 4.9 PERCENT MORE WORKERS

NEW YORK, March 8.—Manufacturing activity in January, as measured by man-hours worked, was 9.3 percent higher than in December, the fourth successive monthly gain, according to the monthly survey of the National Industrial Conference Board an-

nounced today. This gain was a result of an increase of 4.9 percent in number of workers employed and an advance of 4 percent in hours worked.

Average hourly earnings were practically unchanged, advancing only from 59.3 cents in December to 59.4 cents in January. Average weekly earnings, on the other hand, increased 4.4 percent from $20.70 in December to $21.61 in January. This increase more than offset the small advance in the cost of living, with the result that real weekly earnings, or the actual purchasing power of weekly earnings, increased 3.3 percent.

Average working hours per week also advanced from 35 hours in December to 36.4 hours in January, a gain of 4 percent. The combined effect of increased employment and longer working hours was further reflected in a 9.5 percent gain in total pay rolls.

Figures for January 1935, indicate a significant gain since January 1934. During the year average hourly earnings increased 7.8 percent; average weekly earnings, 14.4 percent; average hours of work per week, 6.1 percent; real weekly earnings, 8.6 percent; total employment, 7 percent; total man-hours, 13.7 percent; and total pay rolls, 22.4 percent.

The cost of living of wage earners advanced 1 percent from December 1934 to January 1935. This rise, considerably higher than the average seasonal gain, is principally due to an increase of 3.4 percent in retail-food prices. The purchasing value of the dollar in January 1935 was 122.5 cents, as compared with 100 cents in 1923.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 10, 1935]

FILMS SHOW PROFIT ON 1934 BUSINESS—COMPANY EARNINGS AVERAGED 100-PERCENT INCREASE OVER 1933, YEAR BOOK SAYS

The motion-picture industry came out of the red in 1934, according to the 1935 Film Daily Year Book, just issued. Attendance was up, volume and quality of picture production soared, gross receipts were increased, and earnings of the film companies averaged more than 100-percent increase over the previous year.

The average weekly attendance in the Nation's motion-picture theaters increased about 15 percent to an approximate total of 70,000,000. The average had been 60,000,000 in 1933 and 1932, 75,000,000 in 1931 and 110,000,000 in 1930, the all-time high.

A corresponding increase in total box-office receipts was shown. This was due almost entirely to the increased number of patrons rather than a rise in admission prices, which remained almost stationary.

"Despite higher costs under the code," the year book reports, "the industry effected other economies that enabled it to end the year substantially in the black, compared with a loss the year before."

[From the New York Times, Mar. 10, 1935]

JANUARY INDUSTRY BEST IN 17 MONTHS—MORE-THAN-SEASONAL RISE IN OUTPUT PUSHED INDEX TO 90 PERCENT OF 1923–25 AVERAGE—EXPORTS ABOVE DECEMBER—FIRST SUCH INCREASE SINCE 1929—FACTORY EMPLOYMENT ADVANCED BY 1.9 PERCENT

WASHINGTON, March 9.—A more-than-seasonal expansion of industrial production during January was reported today by the Commerce Department's survey of current business, the adjusted index rising to 90 percent of the 1923–25 average. This was the highest point since August 1933, when the precode rush of activity terminated.

Such data as were available for February indicated that the increase in industrial output for that month approximated the usual seasonal change. Production in the first 2 months of 1935 had been the highest for this period since 1930, the survey stated.

The number employed by factories in mid-January showed "a contraseasonal" increase, as compared with December, the adjusted index advancing to 80.4 percent of the 1923–25 average, a rise of 1.9 percent. A further increase for the succeeding reporting period was indicated by available data.

LAG IN DISTRIBUTION

"Distribution series did not follow the trend of the production index," the survey said. "The increase in freight-car loadings during January equaled the usual seasonal rise for the month, while sales through retail stores apparently declined by more than the estimated seasonal amount, following the December gains.

"Sales of automobiles, on the other hand, were sharply higher in January.

"A substantial gain in the volume of residential building featured the construction reports for January. Total construction contracts awarded, however, have been in relatively small volume and the seasonally adjusted index for January, which is based on a 3-month moving average, dropped 4 points to 27 percent of the 1923–25 average."

[From the Baltimore Sun, Mar. 11, 1935]

STEEL OPERATIONS RISE 2 POINTS—MAGAZINE PREDICTS AUTO DEMAND WILL MAINTAIN LEVEL SEVERAL WEEKS—CAN PLANTS SET RECORD—HIGHER PRICES FOR FARM PRODUCTS STIMULATE CALL FOR AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENTS

CLEVELAND, March 10.—The national average of steel operations last week rose 2 points to 50 percent through sustained shipments and consumption of flat-rolled steel and a moderately broadening demand for structural steel and pipe, the magazine Steel states today.

Sheet and strip mills, operating at 75 percent, have accumulated sufficient backlogs, mainly from automobile manufacturers, to continue at this level for 5 or 6 weeks, with specifications extending as far ahead as May.

AUTO ASSEMBLIES INCREASE

Automobile assemblies, the magazine states, increased to 86,000 units last week from 83,900 the week before. The industry now estimates second-quarter production at from 300,000 to 400,000 per month.

Higher prices of farm products are stimulating demand for agricultural implements. Steel continues. Manufacturers are experiencing their best operations in 5 years and some are encountering a shortage of skilled machine operators.

CAN SPEED TIN-PLATE MILLS

Tin-plate mills are scheduled for an advance from the current rate of 80-percent operation. Two leading can manufacturers have consumed more tin plate so far this year than in any similar period in their history.

Inquiries for structural steel are increasing.

Railroad orders expected to call for 100,000 tons of rails are being deferred until fall, the magazine reports.

Steel-ingot production in February averaged 114,255 gross tons daily, an increase of 8.8 percent above January. It was the highest since June of last year.

CHICAGO AREA GAINS

Chicago steel-works operations last week advanced 2 points to 55 percent, Pittsburgh 1 point to 38 percent, Wheeling 14 to 92 percent, Youngstown 5 to 55 percent, Birmingham held at 55½, Cleveland 74, and New England was down 2 points to 61, Eastern Pennsylvania 1 to 28½, Buffalo 2 to 38, and Detroit 6 to 94 percent.

Steel's iron and steel price composite is reduced 3 cents to $32.40, finished steel unchanged at $54, and the scrap index is down 12 cents to $11.04.

[From the Baltimore Sun, Mar. 11, 1935]

DAWES GIVES DEPRESSION 2 MONTHS TO REACH END

TUCSON, ARIZ., March 10.—Charles G. Dawes, former Vice President, believes the depression will end in another 2 months and that the Nation will realize it not later than July.

Voicing this conviction in an interview, Dawes said the depressions beginning in 1873 and 1893 lasted 5½ years each as measured by the stock market, and that the one that began in 1929 should wind up in about the same length of time.

"Due to an accumulation of 5 years of postponed demands, June or July of this year should see the beginning of a great sustained demand for durable goods", he said.

[From the Altoona (Pa.) Union, Mar. 5, 1935]

FREIGHT TRAFFIC SHOWS INCREASE—MOVEMENT THROUGH ALTOONA YARD AND OVER MIDDLE DIVISION IN FEBRUARY EXCEEDS THAT OF JANUARY

Freight traffic through the Altoona yard and over the middle division of the Pennsylvania Railroad in February showed an increase over the movement during January and December. The gain is distinctly marked, since the movement in the 28 days of the month exceeded that of the 31-day months. The daily average movement was some 400 cars better than January and about 700 better than December.

The measuring yardstick of traffic is at Denholm, just east of Lewistown, where a record is kept of all cars passing that point. The February movement totaled 121,833 cars. This was a substantial increase when compared with January, when 109,353 cars passed Denholm in 28 days and 120,048 cars in the 31 days. The movement also exceeded that of February 1934, when the total was 107,649 cars. An average of approximately 2,000 cars was moved over the Bald Eagle branch of the middle division at Tyrone.

The number of cars dispatched from the Altoona yard in February was 140,177. This was 12,876 cars more than were moved in 28 days in January and 164 less than were moved in the 31 days of the month. The number of cars dispatched in January was 127,301 in 28 days and 140,341 for the entire month.

The number of cars classified and moved over the eastbound and westbound humps in the Altoona yard in February totaled 112,081, as against 103,833 in the entire month of January, a gain of 6,248 cars. It was also an increase of 15,129 cars over the cars humped in December.

The Altoona yard forces in February handled a total of 3,901 trains as against 3,867 trains in January. They were made up of a total of 282,657 cars, an increase of 414 over the number included in all the trains moved in January. The increase in traffic was responsible for the recalling of 43 furloughed brakemen for service in the yard and 10 on the middle division during the month, bringing the total of men called back to work since the beginning of the year to 63.

The number of trains received in the Altoona yard from the middle division was 1,069, with a total of 74,648 cars. The trains dispatched from the yard to the middle division reached a total of 1,024, with 75,178 cars. This was 1 train and 1,976 cars less than were handled throughout the 32 days of January.

There was received from the central region or Pittsburgh division a total of 969 trains made up of 67,832 cars. Trains dispatched from Altoona yard to the Pittsburgh division totaled 839 trains with 64,999 cars. This was 33 trains more than in the whole month of January, but 1,562 cars less in the make-up of the trains. This movement to and from the central region reflects the extent of the traffic being moved over the Pittsburgh division.

Enginemen and trainmen employed in the Altoona yard and on the middle division made good time and in addition the extra men on their rosters enjoyed a greater number of workdays than in the past several months. To handle the increased volume of freight traffic and to keep it moving up to Pennsylvania Railroad standard, it was necessary to recall a half dozen or more extra firemen and 26 yard and 10 road brakemen.

[From the Providence (R. I.) News-Tribune, Feb. 28, 1935]

OLD COLONY BANK SHOWS BIG INCREASE—E. H. WEEKS, RENAMED PRESIDENT, POINTS TO $984,800 INCREASE IN RESOURCES

Edward H. Weeks, who today was reelected president of the Old Colony Cooperative Bank, told stockholders in his annual report that the bank showed a gain of $984,800.43 in resources during 1934.

Home Owners' Loan Corporation bonds amounting to $1,695,150 were acquired by the bank, and he called attention to the fact the bank had subscribed $158,000 to stock of a new home-loan bank opened in Boston. The local bank, Weeks said, ranks seventh in size among members of the United States Building & Loan League.

[From the Boston Transcript, Mar. 5, 1935]

AMERICAN TOBACCO EARNINGS ROSE OVER 36 PERCENT—NET LAST YEAR EQUAL TO $4.46 SHARE, AGAINST $3.04 SHARE IN PREVIOUS YEAR

Consolidated net earnings of the American Tobacco Co. for 1934 were more than 36 percent greater than those in the preceding year, amounting to $24,084,280, after all charges and reserves, but before deducting $870,000 for tax contingencies relative to prior years, according to the annual report issued today. This is equal, after dividend requirements on the 6-percent cumulative preferred stock to $4.46 a share on the 4,688,277 combined common and common B shares, excluding 55,562 shares in the treasury. In 1933 consolidated net earnings amounted to $17,401,208, or $3.04 a share on the common stock.

The consolidated balance sheet for December 31 last shows current assets of $166,861,801 and current liabilities of $9,314,457 compared with $161,097,881 and $7,245,942, respectively, at the end of 1933. Cash was $29,005,961, against $32,958,634. Marketable securities at cost were $5,633,836, while none was held at the close of the previous year. Inventories at cost totaled $121,612,398, compared with $115,480,477. Brands, trade marks, patents, and goodwill were unchanged at $54,099,430. Surplus decreased from $108,627,695 at the beginning of 1934 to $105,251,116 at the close of the year.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Mar. 8, 1935]

KENNEDY HAILS ISSUE BY SWIFT OF $43,000,000—BREAK IN JAMMED MARKET OF NATION, SAYS LEADER OF REFUNDING PROPOSITION

WASHINGTON, March 7.—The first thaw in the frozen capital market was seen by Joseph P. Kennedy, Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission, today in the registration by Swift & Co., of Chicago, of a $43,000,000 issue of 3¾-percent bonds. The proceeds will be used to retire outstanding 5-percent bonds and notes.

The issue, the largest single registration of securities under the 1933 act, is viewed as the first fruit of the new simplified regulations promulgated by the Commission January 14, for "old and going" corporations, in issuing new securities.

In addition to hailing the Swift issue as pointing the way for other important refinancing operations under the new regulations, officers of the Commission noted that the interest rate offered was the lowest for industrial bonds since the World War. The rate is less than 1 percent above the average yield on Government bonds. The registration is the first of the new form A–2, promulgated by the Commission on January 14 for use by seasoned corporations.

[From the New York Evening Post, Mar. 9, 1935]

FACTORIES HUM, PAY ROLLS GAIN, SURVEYS SHOW—JANUARY MARKED BY MANUFACTURING EXPANSION

Reversing the usual seasonal trend, factory pay rolls increased for the second consecutive month in January.

This coincided with an unusually sharp expansion in manufacturing activity.

The gains are reported in a survey by the Alexander Hamilton Institute.

At the same time, however, the Institute reported that the number of unemployed rose in January to 13,657,000 from 13,034,000 in December.

These figures are at variance with an estimate made public earlier this week by Harry L. Hopkins, Federal Relief Administrator, that the number of unemployed had dropped to 11,000,000. Mr. Hopkins said that F. R. A. surveys all over the country showed unemployment on the wane.

TEN-POINT GAIN

The Institute's index of factory output, based on 1923–25 as 100 and unadjusted for seasonal variation, rose from 77 in December to 87 in January. The index thus nearly regained the 1934 peak of 89 reached last April.

Manufacturing activity in January was 16 percent higher than in the corresponding month last year.

The pay-roll gain in January over the previous month, according to the institute, amounted to 1.4 percent as compared with an average seasonal decrease of 4.2 percent. Since 1919 pay rolls rose in only one other January—1920.

MOTORS IN LEAD

Motor manufacturing led the trade advance this week, steel activity gained momentum, and commodity prices, particularly food and farm prices, climbed to higher levels.

On the other hand, cotton-cloth production slowed down, the stock market continued to slump, and February's construction volume of $75,100,000, reported during the week, was the lowest for any month since May 1933—almost the low of the depression.

This picture of the situation is presented by Business Week in its weekly survey.

Business Week says:

"The one major industry which is undaunted by legislative or monetary threats is the automobile industry. Motor-plant employment has been stepped up to the 1929 level; January output of 303,372 cars was the largest for the month since 1929."

"TAXING FOR PROSPERITY"—EDITORIAL IN WASHINGTON DAILY NEWS

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Taxing for Prosperity", which appeared in the Washington Daily News of March 15, 1935. I make this request in view of the pertinency of the editorial to pending legislation.

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

[From the Washington Daily News, Mar. 15, 1935]

TAXING FOR PROSPERITY

Governor Eccles, of the Federal Reserve Board, is an obstinate witness. Twice within a week he refused to permit House Banking Committee members to limit him to answering their academic questions about currency magic and hypothetical price levels.

Being a realist, Mr. Eccles insisted upon going to the nub of our economic problem—the shrinkage in purchasing power. And in his last statement he took the trouble to explain how purchasing power should be restored. Let the Government, he said, through public-works expenditures, put out money to potential consumers whose incomes are now so low they cannot buy the things they need. Let the Government, he said, get as much money as possible for public works by intelligent income taxes which will drain off surplus savings that cannot be profitably invested in production until the buying market is revived.

Such a program would end the profligate Government borrowing, redistribute our national income and put it to work, help to end unemployment, provide stagnant business with a market for goods and an opportunity to make a profit, and give incentive to investment.

Specific tax plans aimed at this objective have been proposed by Senators COUZENS and LA FOLLETTE.

The Michigan Senator proposes an increase in the coroporation excess-profits tax. Instead of taking 5 percent of profits in excess of 12½ percent, as under the present law, he would have the Government take 5 percent of profits in excess of 8 percent, and graduate the tax up to 40 percent of profits in excess of 30 percent.

Surely this is a fair tax. In times like these, when so many businesses are unable to make any profits, the corporations enjoying unusually high returns should be willing to pay liberally to support the system upon which they depend.

Such a tax might not produce a large revenue, but it would encourage high-profit-making corporations to spend more for wages and thus contribute in another way to purchasing power.

The Wisconsin Senator proposes higher income taxes from the bottom to the top. He would increase the number of income-tax payers by lowering the exemption from $2,500 to $2,000 for married persons and from $1,000 to $800 for single persons. He would hike the normal tax from 4 to 6 percent and increase surtaxes all the way up the ladder, taking 71 percent instead of 59 percent of income in excess of a million dollars.

Senator LA FOLLETTE is right in contending that income-tax payers, both high and low, should pay more. Even the income-tax payers in the lower brackets belong to a select society.

About 37,000,000 families, including unattached single persons, reside in this country, in 1929 about 20,000,000 families had incomes less than $2,000 a year. In 1932 the number of such families was about 35,000,000.

The bill for our huge emergency expenditures must be paid. It is more equitable to tax on an ability to pay basis, by income levies from the few millions who get more than $2,000 a year, than by sales levies that fall heaviest upon the many millions who get less than $2,000 a year.

ST. PATRICK'S DAY—ADDRESSES BY SENATOR GUFFEY AND SENATOR BURKE

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD addresses on St. Patrick's Day delivered by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BURKE] before the Irish Fellowship Club at Chicago, Saturday, March 16, 1935.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

God made a generous gift to the world when he placed Irishmen in our midst. Surely no man in politics in the United States has been shown more loyalty and devotion by Irishmen in Pennsylvania than myself. May I also refer to old friends in Chicago whom I was proud to know in an older day, Roger Sullivan and George Brennan, Mayor Dever, and Judge Dunne, and more recently your distinguished and brilliant mayor, Edward Kelly?

I have not held office very long, but my experience in politics has taught me this great lesson—that few of us who reach office and power, gain distinction on the basis of merit alone. We gain office and influence through being lifted upon the shoulders of loyal friends who, forgetting our poor weaknesses, emphasize the few virtues we possess.

History, the highest court of humanity, testifies to the irrefutable fact that in every crisis which has confronted America, Irishmen and the sons of Irishmen have been the sturdiest supporters of our Government in its struggles on land and sea. In a broader aspect, there has been no movement for liberty throughout the world which has not felt the quickening pulse of Irish thought, Irish action, and Irish sacrifice.

In 1776, in the English Parliament, that great Irish triumvirate of force and eloquence, Burke, Barie, and Conally, fought for America's rights. The genius, the statesmanship, the vision, the human sympathy of the Irish have ever expressed themselves in every kind of human activity. That little green isle, smaller than the State of Maine, less in population than the city of New York, has produced men and women who have blazed the way in every avenue of human endeavor; they have garnered all the fields of thought; they have nothing touched they have not adorned.

The wisdom of Irish philosophy, the melody of Irish song, the inspiration of Irish valor, and the pathos of Irish martyrdom will live in the loving memories of men as long as Erin's fields are emerald; as long as the Shannon flows toward the sea.

For centuries Ireland gave her richest gifts to all the world, and her sons went with a smile, not a frown; the barefoot monk with his Bible; the sweet-voiced minstrel with his harp; without thought of self or power, seeking only the salvation and happiness of mankind.

It is a sad commentary that this land which never sought to subdue a neighbor should be the predestined spoil of the invader; that this country whose master passion is the love of liberty should suffer the vilest and most galling servitude ever recorded in all the black annals of oppression.

When I think of Ireland it seems to me as if God had refreshed Himself when He set this emerald in a sapphire sea. A beautiful legend tells us that God, taking all the broken pieces of the world into His mighty hand, fashioned England to give the world solidity. Then He gave the world a rainbow hue when He added France. Wishing to give art, music, and literature to the world, He added Italy and rested content when He gave adventurous Spain her place in the sun. But good St. Patrick, the legend continues, turning to God, said: "Master, Thy work is incomplete. Now give us, good God, a country with the heart of a child and the smile of God." And thus Ireland was born. And so the world was sprinkled with Irish genius, Irish statesmanship, and Irish eloquence.

The incongruous thing is that for centuries Irishmen of rare ability were welcomed everywhere but in their own country. Scattered all over Europe have been found brave Irish generals, dexterous Irish diplomats, Irish counts, Irish barons, Irish Knights of St. Louis and St. Leopold, of the White Eagle and the Golden Fleece, who, had they remained in their own house of bondage, could not have been ensigns of marching regiments or freemen of petty corporations.

For freedom of conscience, of speech, and of the press, for the security of his person, and the sanctity of his home, for the right to serve his country with honor in time of peace and with distinction in time of war, the Irishman has willingly suffered more than 2 centuries of unremitting martyrdom. These rights, purchased at such a price in the Old World, will not be surrendered without a fight in the New, at the behest of man or any set of men. At this good hour, let patriots of every race and creed rededicate themselves to that full measure of freedom for which Irishmen for centuries fought and fell. Let brave and wise men everywhere turn a face of flint to every recurring form of bigotry of oppression, and every attempt to limit, betray, or deny those inalienable rights vouchsafed to us by the wisdom of Irish sages and the valor of Irish heroes.

In these grave crises confronting our country today, we have no choice but to support and cooperate with the President. There is no alternative. Either Franklin Roosevelt and his program succeed, or we fail. Success means happiness and prosperity; failure means ruin. What is the mightiest force the Irish-American man and woman can put behind the President? They can put back of it a force as irresistible as the tides of the ocean; the force of faith, and the force of love of country of every Irish-American in this country.

God save me from the gloomy, sorrowful, melancholy, too logical man, these hapless and hopeless disciples of H. G. Wells and Dean Inge who predict the end of all things by 1960. They are like the doubting Thomases who, sitting at a ball game, believe that every game ends with the defeat of their favorite team in the third inning. They are the gloomy Hamlets who sit by your bedside and with direful forebodings exclaim, "You can't recover", "There is no hope."

Through the generations the doubting Thomases have been the stumbling blocks to progress. They stood at the foot of the cross on the hill of Golgotha and, looking up at the stricken form of their Savior, cried out, "If Thou be Christ, why dost Thou not come down from the cross?"

In the days of Washington they watched the retreat at Long Island with dismay and disdain and though pretending to admire Washington, declared his retreat was an ignoble and futile military move.

These critics of Washington could not see further than the immediate cloudy present; they could not see the star of victory rising in the sky beyond.

We face a like situation today. The hour of faith and of test is here. Unlike the demands made upon our courage and fortitude during the critical days of the war, we are not asked to carry a gun, to die on a sun-bleached battlefield, or cross a submarine-infested sea. But we are asked to support the most courageous President since Illinois gave Abraham Lincoln to the Nation. And we should support Franklin Roosevelt, not merely by believing in his humanitarian policies but "by talking them up" to the doubters and critics who have nothing to offer in their stead. And when it comes to talking for a cause, no one is better fitted to do this than the Irish.

The critics of the various agencies of the administration say they are untried things, experiments with chaos around the corner. These self-same critics are the ones who want to go back to the greed and speculation which brought on the terrible days of 1929.

It is true we are off the beaten path; that through sheer desperation, when there appeared no other way, we blazed a trail through the wilderness of doubt and hesitation to seek a new pathway to opportunity and success. And this under the leadership of Franklin D. Roosevelt. The first thing we did was to recover our lost freedom; to blot out of our Federal Constitution a police regulation which should never have found lodgment there; we freed ourselves from the intolerance of minorities and bigotry and reasserted our right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness by repealing the eighteenth amendment.

In the old days of 1492 when Columbus was battering at the palace doors to induce King Ferdinand and Queen Isabella to endorse his plans and further his hopes, the die-hards and stand-patters were as usual berating, criticizing, and knocking down the new things Columbus stood for and which his genius later made a reality.

The earth was flat and Columbus was insane to argue otherwise. Those doubting Thomases laughed Columbus' new idea to scorn, but Columbus was undeterred. Yet there came a time when even Columbus had to give way when faced with the unknown.

Even the compass which was his guide failed as the servant to his genius. Just recently I ran across the following when reading a sketch of his life: "Columbus, disconcerted by the immensity of space, of which he had reached the boundary, abandoned the route he had traced on the map and followed the flight of the birds, feeling that the instinct of the birds would not direct them all toward one point if they did not see earth there."

This is what we are doing in America today through the activities of our new Federal agencies. We have turned from the old, outworn charts and are following the path of instinct and the urge of conscience, knowing that in the end they will guide us in the right direction.

We are taking part in a war against the twin monsters of depression—hunger and poverty. What Irishman would refuse to enlist under this banner in company with Uncle Sam and Franklin Roosevelt? Never before was the good nature, the fine companionship, and the everlasting faith in the fundamental things of the Irishman so necessary. The Irish child who sprang from poverty knows the blows that are being struck, the blood that is being drawn.

Who better than the Irishman is able to glimpse the horizons, to see beyond the vale of this mortal life to the immeasurable hills and stars; to that far-off land where God will gather us all together as brothers within the sacred gates through which St. Patrick passed so long ago. There is no one in all the world who defies adversity like an Irishman nor one so willing to engage it in deadly combat. In victory he shows neither malice nor arrogance; in defeat he smiles through his tears, knowing full well that his faith in God will strengthen him for ultimate victory.

Therefore I have no fear for my country, for as long as there is Irish blood flowing through American veins our freedom is secure and our liberty safe.

ADDRESS OF HON. EDWARD R. BURKE

Almost 200 years ago there was held a celebration of Saint Patrick's Day, the first known to the record, within the borders of what is now the United States of America. On March 17, 1737, the newly organized Charitable Irish Society of Boston met, on the anniversary of St. Patrick's death, to do honor to the memory of Ireland's beloved saint. That custom spread throughout the Colonies, was observed during the years of the Revolutionary War by the Continental Army upon the direct orders of the Commander in Chief, George Washington, and today is recognized by appropriate ceremonies in all parts of the Union.

What is the purpose of this celebration? What profit to us in this age to gather around the banquent board and toast in song and spoken word the memory of Saint Patrick? Two hundred years have passed since that small group of Irishmen met in

Boston. We pause a moment to glance back over the years. That sparsely settled fringe of Colonies clinging to the Atlantic seacoast, struggling for bare existence against a cruel nature, beset by hostile Indians, facing usually a lack of sympathy from the mother country, with jealous continental nations seeking always an opportunity to spread their dominion in the new western world, had problems that must have seemed to them fully as serious as any that we face today. Yet, with undaunted courage, they proceeded to tame the wilderness and establish local government.

The War of Independence was fought and won by patriots, every unit of whose fighting forces on land and sea was filled with Irishmen in the ranks and in places of leadership. A declaration of independence and a constitution for the new union of States were drafted to take high position among the immortal documents of the human race, each bearing the signature of many men of Irish birth and descent. A second war against Great Britain was brought to a successful conclusion. Fifty years later the Union was preserved, and the doctrine firmly established that it shall ever remain "one and inseparable." There followed American participation in the most terrible war in all history. Meanwhile, from a few scattered thousands, a Nation of 125,000,000 has come into being, spread across a vast continent, with splendid cities linked together by a marvelous system of transportation and communication. We call attention in passing only to the fact that on these many battlefields, in the conquest of the wilderness and the desert, in the stupendous growth of business and industry, in the wide diffusion of the arts and sciences, learning and culture, a proud and compelling part was played by Irish men and women.

If it should seem to you tonight, when in memory we retrace these 200 years to the first celebration in America of St. Patrick's Day, that we are going back into history a long time in the effort to shed light on the question as to why we continue to celebrate this day, then you must also keep in mind this thought: More than six times as long a period elapsed between the death of St. Patrick and that first long-ago American celebration in Boston than has passed since then. For, according to what appears to be the authentic record, the date of the death of St. Patrick was about the year 465. We are told that he had been taken as a boy slave to pagan Ireland in the early part of that century. After 7 long years of servitude he either escaped or was permitted to return to the Continent. There, for a quarter of a century, he studied and prayed to prepare himself for the great task to which he had consecrated his life. Something about those wild Irish masters whom he had served, and observed, caused St. Patrick to believe that he had come in contact with a race of men not born to live and die in a day, but with a work to do through all the ages. So he had determined to return, when he had fully prepared himself, as a missionary to this isle of the sea and bring the light of Christianity to its people.

About the year 432, St. Patrick landed once more in Ireland. He came now, not as an unwilling slave driven to daily toil, but freely as a bearer of good tidings. The Irish, even in their pagan state, were by nature deeply religious. They had worshipped the sun, the moon, the trees. No people ever accepted more readily, more joyously, the message of the true Gospel of Christ. It must also be recorded, and shame that it should be so, that no people has suffered more by reason of its conversion. But proudly can it be said that no people ever remained more steadfast therein than have the Irish.

We return now to the question, Why celebrate this day? What profit may come to us as a people by keeping alive the memory of St. Patrick? Shall we say because it affords an opportunity for all those to gather who trace kinship, however remote, to the Emerald Isle in order to pay homage to the great deeds and the heroic exploits of Irishmen? If that be so, then others, with more of Irish eloquence must tell of the patriotic service in every land of her brave men and noble women. Others, again, must sing the sweet, sad songs of Ireland. To others I must leave the joy of telling stories rich with Irish humor, and of painting in bold colors the great contribution of Irishmen to the world's literature and learning. These are, indeed, reasons enough to glory in our Irish ancestry. It is a heritage of which we may well be proud.

I ask you to think tonight of St. Patrick as an inspiring leader, and of the great good that may come when a true leader finds a people with the spirit and the courage that enables them to accept in full degree that leadership. Such a leader was St. Patrick. Such a people were the Irish of that day. They followed him out of the darkness of paganism into the light of Christianity. So great was his influence that through all the succeeding generations, from that day to this, the descendants of those who accepted the leadership of St. Patrick have been willing to endure all manner of hardship, death itself, rather than prove faithless. Centuries have rolled over the grave of St. Patrick, but today, as truly as fifteen hundred years ago, Irishmen gladly acknowledge him as their true leader.

We now in our land face crucial problems. Is there a leader, unselfish, clear visioned, far-sighted, who is able to point the way? Is the spirit of the American people such that they can distinguish the false doctrines always so glibly put forth at such a time, and rallying behind a true leader permit nothing to deflect them either to the right hand or to the left? I declare my faith that we have such a leader. Have we, the people, the common sense and the courage to support that leadership? Only so in no other way than by our united support will it be possible for us to travel far along the path where lies happiness and well-being for all of our people.

There is unrest in America. It is not to be wondered. Millions of citizens denied the opportunity to work. No condition can exist more serious than to have great numbers of our people willing to work, able to work, desperately seeking work, and no work to be found. As the result of that unemployment the purchasing power of our people is so reduced as to destroy the market for the products of our factories and our farms. Since our farm population could no longer purchase the products of our factories, their doors must open and more millions pour forth to join the ranks of the unemployed, thus further reducing the demand for all that the farmer has to sell. Here we have the vicious circle at its worst. Here we have a picture of human bewilderment and woe that must provoke the laughter of the evil spirits—if such there be. A land of plenty, with fertile fields, unbounded natural resources, a vigorous and industrious people. Great stores of goods on the one hand, and on the other a vast army of consumers in need of those very necessities of life but lacking the ability to purchase them. Want, in the midst of plenty. Hunger, with food going to waste. Nakedness, while factories and mills stand idle. Human beings living in hovels, with the materials at hand and the labor ready to build and equip comfortable homes for all. We should be living in a golden age. Instead, our very wealth of all good things has choked the channels until stagnation has brought inevitable decay. In the midst of plenty, a people about to perish!

Then came the new leadership. I speak tonight in no partisan sense. There rallied behind the new leaders men from every walk of life—from business, shop, and farm—all with the hope that ruin might still be averted, that somehow an answer could be found to the riddle that seemed to baffle us.

With boldness and high courage, all will admit—with marked intelligence and clear vision, history will record—the problems were attacked. At once it was proclaimed that food, clothing, and shelter should be provided for all in need, and the far-reaching relief organization began to function. In industry a program to establish maximum hours of work and thus spread employment; minimum wages, and so maintain a decent standard of living. Child labor abolished. Unfair competitive practices largely eliminated. A vast enterprise af public-works developed to take up the slack in employment. In agriculture, an effort to balance production with the effective demand for the products of the farm. Confidence restored in our banking institutions, and needed reforms established in our monetary system. A stupendous effort put forth in every direction under what is admitted to be probably the most inspiring leadership the country has ever known.

Over night almost, the spirit of the people changed. As our Irish ancestors discarded the way of the heathen and accepted the true life set forth by St. Patrick, so the American people in 1933 rallied behind the new leader who came preaching relief, recovery, and reform. Then was observed a unity in our national life seldom before experienced. On all sides men began to say: "Life is once more worth while. All will yet be well with us." True it is that after the first breath-taking days, during which all factionalism had been sunk for the general welfare, there came a revival of opposition on the part of those who would approach these serious problems from a different angle. There was nothing alarming about this. Such criticism is normal, such opposition is to be desired. Mistakes are certain to be made. They can best be held to a minimum, or corrected most speedily when made, if we have the critical appraisal of a virile opposition party.

But now comes the real challenge to the leadership that brought us out of despair, restored our confidence, and put us on the road to national well-being. "This progress is too slow", say these would-be leaders. "Nothing really has been accomplished", we are told. "The depression is still untouched." "The rich continue to grow richer, and the poor poorer." There is held before our eyes the sweet promise of a quick way to recovery, a sure method to bring about a redistribution of wealth, that will give riches, or at least comfort, to every man. It amounts simply to this. Take from those who have. Give to those who have not.

The old order is gone, never to return. It may be, that inherent weakness assured its destruction. It may be, that the shock of the World War was too great to be overcome. In any event, we may as well face the fact that we live in a new day and that a new order is to prevail. The question that we must decide is whether we will go forward under proven leadership, retaining all that is good out of the old order, content to struggle up the slope by slow and painful process, under law, with due protection to person and property; or risking all, in one blind, mad leap, attempt to reach what is so glowingly pictured as the fairer land that lies just across the yawning chasm. We have our choice to make. It is a choice of what leaders we choose to follow.

Under somewhat similar circumstances, a dominant figure has emerged in most of our sister nations. In Italy, a Mussolini. In Germany, a Hitler. In Russia, a Stalin. In the United States of America—what shall the answer be? Shall we stand firm behind the incomparable chief to whom, so short a time ago, we pledged our faith? Shall we recognize the magnitude of the burden upon his shoulders, and help to carry it? Do this, my friends, and the most troublesome problems will yet be solved. Do this, all ye who honor St. Patrick, and unborn generations will bless you for the part you this day took, and the choice you made.

As I draw to a close may I say that it is always a pleasure to visit the truly great city in which we meet tonight. Come here and the pulsing, throbbing life about you leaves no doubt that you are in a place destined to play an important part in the affairs of man as long as our civilization shall last. In the short space of little

more than a century what was a mere trading post has become one of the great metropolitan centers of the world. Who is there with imagination so bold as to be able to look ahead a hundred years and picture the grandeur that then may well be the lot of this city you love?

This day, which we have met in your city to celebrate, has a meaning significant and inspiring. It commemorates a heroic leader of long ago. More than that, it honors a race of people who had the vision and the strength to follow that leader regardless of the cost. So on this St. Patrick's Day in this great city, to you of Irish ancestry, who love this city and honor this saint, I bring my message. Even as your Irish forbears 1,500 years ago were quick to sense the right and pledge their unswerving loyalty to the "true deal" as taught and lived by St. Patrick, so today I call upon you to enlist under the banner of the "new deal" as proclaimed by our great President.

"The 'new deal' is an old deal—as old as the earliest aspirations of humanity for liberty and justice and the good life. It is old as Christian ethics, for basically its ethics are the same. It is new as the Declaration of Independence was new, and the Constitution of the United States.

"Its motives are the same; it voices the deathless cry of good men and good women for the opportunity to live and work in freedom, the right to be secure in their homes and in the fruits of their labor, the power to protect themselves against the ruthless and the cunning.

"It recognizes that man is indeed his brother's keeper, insists that the laborer is worthy of his hire, demands that justice shall rule the mighty as well as the weak.

"It seeks to cement our society, rich and poor, manual worker, and brain worker, into a voluntary brotherhood of freemen, standing together, striving together for the common good of all."

With the words of Franklin Roosevelt, I close:

"Keep that vision before your eyes and in your hearts. It can and will be attained."

OPERATION OF THE N. R. A.

Mr. SCHALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an article from the Washington Post of Saturday, March 16, showing what a girl in my State had to do in order to get an extra half-hour for lunch from her employer, who operated his business under the N. R. A.

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

[From the Washington Post of Mar. 16, 1935]

Miss Ada Erler, employed by the "Bee Hive", operated by J. A. Ochs & Son, Inc., at New Ulm, Minn., wanted an extra half hour for lunch.

Here is the record of the case from the files at N. R. A.:

Miss Ada, employed for 20 years by the "Bee Hive", had stomach trouble, and her physician advised rest after meals. Her kindly employer, who was conscientiously operating under the retail code, undertook to extend her lunch period to an hour and a half until she had recovered.

On November 16, 1934, he wrote to N. R. A. petitioning an exemption to this effect and inclosing a physician's certificate that Miss Ada needed the additional rest.

Copies of this petition, together with the physician's report, were sent to all of the N. R. A. advisory boards and to the National Retail Code Authority in order to obtain their recommendations.

The managing director of the National Retail Code Authority in due course reported back to N. R. A. as follows: "In view of the unusual and obviously deserving nature of this case, which is attested to by a physician, I recommend that the petition be approved."

David M. Polak, of the N. R. A. division of research and planning, reported: "The approval of this petition is not contrary to the policy of National Industrial Recovery Act."

Gullie B. Goldin, assistant counsel of N. R. A.'s legal division, reported: "The legal division approves subject to the following:

"1. Line 2 of proposed order, add 'New Ulm, Minn.'

"2. Lines 5, 20, and 24, change words 'applicants', 'they', 'petitioners', etc., to the singular."

Ernest L. Osborne, of the N. R. A. Consumers' Advisory Board, reported: "We have your memorandum of December 5 upon the above subject, and since the question involved is one of hours and no substantial consumer interests appear to be involved, we make no comments thereon at this time."

W. L. Wagler, of N. R. A.'s Industrial Advisory Board, marked his copy of the order "approved."

A. S. Donaldson, acting deputy administrator, reported: "I am of the opinion that the petition has shown undue and unusual hardship as defined in article X, section 6, and warrants approval."

Armed with these recommendations, the final order was issued. After several whereases outlining the facts in the case, the order continued:

"Whereas, the deputy administrator has reported and it appears to the satisfaction of the National Industrial Recovery Board, that the exemption hereinafter granted is necessary and will tend to effectuate the policies of title I of the National Industrial Recovery Act;

"Now, therefore, pursuant to authority vested in it, it is hereby ordered that the above-named applicant be and it hereby is exempted, as of the date of this order from said provisions of said code to the extent hereinafter stated:

"The petitioner is hereby permitted to extend the lunch hour of Miss Ada Erler from 1 hour to 1½ hours until such time as the physical disabilities complained of have been alleviated. This exemption is subject to cancelation by the National Industrial Recovery Board or its agent, with or without hearing."

This order was signed by Harry C. Carr, acting division administrator, and countersigned by A. S. Donaldson, acting deputy administrator, dated January 4. It took 7 weeks.

And that is how Miss Ada got an extra half-hour for lunch.

A tailor who had applied to N. R. A. for permission to work two cutters on Saturday mornings during the November rush season last year got his permission on March 1 of this year.

WORK-RELIEF PROGRAM

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 117) making appropriations for relief purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question before the Senate is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS]. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 10, line 3, after the amendment agreed to, it is proposed to insert the following:

The Federal Emergency Administration of Public Works, established under title II of the National Industrial Recovery Act, is hereby continued until June 30, 1937, and is authorized to perform such of its functions under said act and such functions under this joint resolution as may be authorized by the President. All sums appropriated to carry out the purposes of said act shall be available until June 30, 1937. The President is authorized to sell any securities acquired under said act or under this joint resolution, and all moneys realized from any such sales shall be available to the President, in addition to the sums heretofore appropriated under this joint resolution, for the making of further loans under said act or under this joint resolution.

Mr. GLASS obtained the floor.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President——

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

Mr. GLASS. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. I wish to say just a word. I do not desire the Senator from Virginia to misconstrue my attitude on Saturday or believe it to be an implication of my opposition to his proposal. On Saturday afternoon, when the amendment was presented, most of the Members were at their offices looking after public matters; there were but few on the floor, and I thought it was about time to forego consideration of the joint resolution for the day. For that reason only I objected to the consideration of the amendment.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, it had been my purpose to withdraw the amendment because there seemed to be indicated some opposition to it which would involve extended debate; but finding that there now appears to be no opposition to it, I ask for a vote.

HIGH COST OF FINANCIAL IRRESPONSIBILITY

Mr. SCHALL. Mr. President, we are today asked to appropriate from a Treasury deficit—the greatest peace-time deficit in the history of this or any other nation on earth—a lump sum of $4,000,000,000 subject to the allocation of the Executive, a sum greater than the total yearly revenues of the Government, and to be expended for other purposes than for running the Government.

It is a sum approximately five times the total revenues collected from income taxes, which are normally presumed to be the main source of Government maintenance.

We are asked to do this in face of the fact that receipts from income taxes are reduced for the year 1934 by $240,000,000 below income taxes for the late depression year 1932.

We are asked to turn over this $4,000,000,000 in the face of a fiscal year deficit nearly double that of the same month last year, and in face of accumulated deficits during this "brain trust" regime amounting to approximately $11,000,000,000.

We are asked to further pile up a public debt which is already $10,000,000,000 above July 1932, the accredited low point of the original depression, and $5,000,000,000 above the World War peak.

Furthermore, by an administration elected on the pledge to "balance the Budget", yes; by a President who before election stumped the country on a "balance the Budget"

plea, we are asked to plunge the Treasury so deeply into the red that his Budget Director resigns and is now denouncing the administration of which he was the trusted financial adviser. When the country's Budget Director, a party leader of the majority in Congress, tells his party and his country and his President that this spending orgy, with fiat money and fiat bonds, this irresponsible finance based on a pretense of spending the country out of debt, threatens the breakdown of Government credit and a resultant communism or dictatorship, it would seem to be time for statesmen to ponder.

Since 1932 the public debt has grown by $10,000,000,000, and the yearly interest burden thereon has increased by nearly $200,000,000.

Since 1932 our total yearly receipts from income taxes have shrunk by nearly $240,000,000.

In the fiscal year ending in June 1932 the revenue from income taxes exceeded interest on the public debt by $385,000,000.

In the fiscal year 1934 the case was reversed, and interest on the public debt exceeded total receipts from income taxes, and the same is true for 1933 and again in the current year 1935.

The fiscal year 1931 showed greater receipts from income taxes than the combined 3 years 1933, 1934, and 1935 of the "new deal" in irresponsible finance.

Here we have an object lesson in shrunken yearly income, as against, on the other hand, yearly increasing burdens of debt, doles, and deficits.

What has been accomplished by piling up debt and deficits to burden industry and destroy taxable income? What progress has been made toward employment and reducing the army of unemployed? Has the number of public charges subsisting on public doles been reduced?

Persons on public doles have actually grown in number from 17,000,000 in June 1933 to 22,375,000 in March 1935—an actual increase of 5,375,000, or over 30 percent.

Unemployment in the industrial centers during the same 2 years of the N. R. A. and the "raw deal" has increased by 1,000,000, and unemployment in the rural districts under the "raw deal" of the A. A. A. has increased by 2,000,000.

So the net achievements of 2 years of the "new deal", alias "raw deal", are these:

First. Increase of persons subsisting as public charges, 5,375,000.

Second. Increase of unemployment, including both industrial centers and rural districts, 3,000,000.

Third. Increase of public debt by over $10,000,000,000.

Fourth. Monthly increasing deficits, until the accumulated total since March 1933 exceeds by threefold the combined deficits of the previous years of the depression.

The demand of the President for this additional $4,000,000,000 on top of billions for the A. A. A., the P. W. A., the F. E. R. A., and the ordinary expenditures of Government, says former Budget Director Douglas, as quoted editorially by the Washington Evening Star, has done more to shock the country into a realization of what the future may hold for us than all the criticisms voiced by opponents of Government spending.

It is destroying public confidence until the President and Secretary of the Treasury, in order to market Government bonds, have now entered upon a "baby bond" campaign to unload fiat bonds at discount—a $25 bond for $18.75—upon the small investors, the clerks, and wage earners, and savings depositors That is the same game that was played 200 years ago to lift the British debt in the days of the "South Sea Bubble." But even in the days of the "South Sea Bubble" the harebrained promoters never stooped to the present theory of "becoming wealthy by producing less" which means, as pointed out by Mr. Douglas, that "we can become fabulously wealthy by producing nothing."

By "cracking down" and breaking up industrial production under the 731 codes of the N. R. A. we are destroying all the smaller mill and mine industries and thousands of shopkeepers throughout the land and thereby subjecting them to the abject necessity of accepting Federal subsidy in exchange for political support.

By destroying 40 percent of farm production through the expenditure of $1,000,000,000 a year by the A. A. A. we are driving a once independent and hardy agricultural yeomanry to the servitude of accepting Federal corn-hog checks, Federal cotton checks, Federal wheat and tobacco checks, and, in short, spreading the Tammany Hall system of petty subsidies and charities Nation-wide.

Mark Twain, in his famous story, The Man Who Corrupted Hadleyburg, seems to have given this Federal "brain trust" the key to the philosophy of the "new deal" of financial irresponsibility. For the 40,000,000 voters of the United States the average sum of $100 per head exactly meets the amount of the White House allocation—$4,000,000,000. Mark Twain found that Hadleyburg could be handled for much less than that per capita. He simply held out an invitation and spread the ground bait.

This $4,000,000,000 subject to the allocation of the Executive to meet the "emergency of 1936" was at first, as noted in the President's message, to be expended prior to June 30, 1936. But since that message was written a discovery has been made. If the money is to be distributed by June 30, the effect of the subsidy is likely to expire before election day, November 3, 1936. Therefore the revised plan is to extend the period of the $4,000,000,000 expenditure into the fiscal year 1937, so as to cover the month of October 1936, just before election—the method that was so effective in 1934.

In that way the "emergency of 1936", namely, the Presidential election, may bring assured relief to the Executive "allocator", to the 6,000,000 on Government pay rolls, and to all the office-holding barnacles of the 57 alphabetical varieties of Heinz's pickle barrel—the bureaucracy of the "new deal."

Here we have the program which we are met here today to finance. It matters not that we are adding another $4,000,000,000 to the greatest national deficit in world history.

It matters not that we are piling up a mountainous debt billions above the World War peak. Let the next generation meet that—or declare against it a moratorium.

It matters not that income taxes have dropped $240,000,000 below 1932, while interest on the public debt has climbed $200,000,000, until it now exceeds total receipts from income taxes.

It matters not that this Executive allocation of $4,000,000,000 exceeds the total Federal revenues to meet the actual expenditures of constitutional government.

It matters not that the public confidence and public credit of the United States is undermined and on the road to complete paralysis.

It matters not if the industries that pay the taxes are paralyzed or destroyed and the Constitution is violated in all of its vital provisions—provided the so-called "emergency" of November 3, 1936, can be bridged, and the cost passed on to the homes and the workers and their children in the next generation.

One-half of that $4,000,000,000—loaded on top of the further billions for the P. W. A., the A. A. A., and the thousand other demands for government—would meet the actual requirements. All the rest is pure political subsidy. Is this America or a Federalized Tammany Hall?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I should like to modify the amendment which I have had printed and is now lying on the desk. I send the modified amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment as modified will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In lieu of the amendment heretofore offered it is proposed, on page 2, line 7, to strike out the numerals "1937" and insert in lieu thereof "1936", and in

the same line to strike out "$4,000,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$2,000,000,000", so as to read:

That in order to provide relief and work relief, there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to be used in the discretion and under the direction of the President, to be immediately available and to remain available until June 30, 1936, the sum of $2,000,000,000, together with the separate funds estabished for particular areas by proclamation of the President pursuant to section 15 (f) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act (but any amounts thereof shall be available for use only for the area for which the fund was established)—

And so forth.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator wherein the revised or modified amendment differs from his original amendment?

Mr. ADAMS. The original amendment changed the language of the joint resolution in several respects. The amendment as modified tends to eliminate not only the conflict between the statement of purposes and the wording of the joint resolution as it stands, but it limits the change to two specific points in order that there might be no confusion in its consideration or discussion. It merely reduces the amount of the appropriation from $4,000,000,000 to $2,000,000,000, and limits the time within which it shall be available, changing it from June 30, 1937, to June 30, 1936. In other words, it cuts $2,000,000,000 off the appropriation and 1 year off the period within which it is available. I think that should simplify the discussion considerably. That presents the point which I wish at this time to submit.

The amendment involves both a vast appropriation and, I believe, a great principle. I trust Senators have not entirely closed their minds upon the question. It seems to me the matter is of such momentous importance that any Senator would be unwise in arriving in his own mind at a verdict before he has heard the case argued.

The premise upon which I wish to argue the case is a text which I am drawing from a statement of the distinguished senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] which he made on the 23d of February 1935, at which time, in speaking of the then pending appropriation measure, the leader of the majority said:

The time has arrived when patriotism should be placed above politics, both personal and partisan.

With that statement I agree and upon that statement I stand. I have reached my conclusion reluctantly, not willingly, and I reached it only after hearing the testimony before the Appropriations Committee given by those who are the proponents and advocates of the joint resolution. After having given careful consideration to the joint resolution and to the testimony, I have come to the conclusion, reluctantly, as I have said, that the joint resolution is unsound in its principle and that the cost of its operation will endanger the credit of the United States.

The joint resolution proposes two things. One is the elimination of direct relief, or, as some choose to call it, the elimination of the dole. Secondly, it proposes the establishment of an employment wage scale for relief on a security wage basis.

The appropriation carried in the joint resolution is the largest appropriation, so far as I know, that has ever been made in any bill upon any subject in any legislative body in the world. That of itself entitled it to some consideration, certainly in times of stress.

The arguments for the joint resolution are in substance these: First, it is said that the present method of administering direct relief is destructive of the morale of those receiving it; that it is breaking down the self-respect of the recipients; that it is sacrificing their pride. Secondly, it is said that the joint resolution, by giving work to those on relief instead of merely giving them relief, will give both direct employment to them and indirect employment to others who will provide the material to be consumed in the work.

There is no question as to the argument about morale, there is no question as to the argument about direct employment, there is no question about the argument as to indirect employment. Then it is the hope of those advocating the joint resolution that the back of the depression will be broken and that unemployment will end. That point is the one upon which I disagree.

Morale is mentioned. Unquestionably the morale of men on relief is lowered. Unquestionably it is desirable to have ment put to work. But, as has been stated here by one of the advocates of the measure, the sole purpose of the joint resolution is to put three and one-half million men to work. Unfortunately it is a correct statement, that the only purpose in mind and the only people in mind have been the three and one-half million unemployed on relief and their dependents.

Unfortunately there are 105,000,000, at least, who are being overlooked in the joint resolution. There are 40,000,000 men now at work, and there are many millions of taxpayers. Their morale is likewise involved and should be considered.

We cannot afford to build up the morale of three and one-half million men and destroy the morale of 100,000,000 people. That I am fearful is what will happen. We are overlooking the 40,000,000 employed, we are overlooking the taxpayers, we are overlooking the 7,000,000 unemployed men who are not on relief. The 7,000,000 or more are men who have refused to take relief. They have taken up a hole or two in their belts and are struggling against heavy odds to keep themselves off of relief under conditions of distress and pressure.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield to enable me to suggest the absence of a quorum?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Colorado yield for that purpose?

Mr. ADAMS. I yield.

Mr. GLASS. We are considering an extremely important amendment to the joint resolution, and I think there ought to be a quorum of the Senate present. Therefore, I make the point of no 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	Coolidge	King	Radcliffe
Ashurst	Copeland	La Follette	Reynolds
Austin	Costigan	Lewis	Robinson
Bachman	Couzens	Logan	Russell
Bailey	Cutting	Lonergan	Schall
Bankhead	Dickinson	McAdoo	Schwellenbach
Barbour	Dieterich	McGill	Sheppard
Barkley	Donahey	McKellar	Shipstead
Bilbo	Fletcher	McNary	Smith
Black	Frazier	Maloney	Steiwer
Bone	George	Metcalf	Thomas, Okla.
Borah	Gerry	Minton	Thomas, Utah
Brown	Gibson	Moore	Townsend
Bulkley	Glass	Murphy	Trammell
Bulow	Guffey	Murray	Truman
Burke	Hale	Neely	Tydings
Byrd	Harrison	Norbeck	Vandenberg
Byrnes	Hastings	Norris	Van Nuys
Capper	Hatch	Nye	Wagner
Carey	Hayden	O'Mahoney	Walsh
Clark	Johnson	Pittman	Wheeler
Connally	Keyes	Pope	White

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, I rise to reannounce the absence of Senators as previously announced by me today.

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

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, again I wish to call the attention of the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] to the fact that my little talk is based upon premises which he has laid down. I know he will recognize that that is a good starting-point and a sound premise for an argument.

The senior Senator from Arkansas said the time had arrived when patriotism should be placed above politics, both personal and partisan. As stated before, it was upon that ground that I was trying to present this case, which I think does transcend personal and partisan interests, and involves a very great issue of patriotism. We may have different opinions as to the correct conclusion; but, as the Senator from Arkansas has said, it is a decision which should be made in accordance with the welfare of our country, and not in accordance with anybody's personal or political welfare, or the welfare of any party or any group.

This amendment was considered by the Appropriations Committee, and three votes were taken upon it. The first time the amendment carried by a vote of 9 to 8. The second time it was lost on a tie vote. The third time it was lost by a majority of one against it. I merely call that matter to the attention of the Senate so that they may realize that the amendment received serious consideration, and was a subject of decided difference of opinion. I may add that each time the weight of the vote may be questioned, because the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] voted for the amendment, and I am disposed to think his vote ought to be given more than a single count, in view of the fact that he is the best-posted man upon these problems. He, being the chairman of the committee, gave himself only one vote, and I think once he even omitted to vote.

Mr. President, the objections which have occurred to me in reference to this joint resolution are several. I have discussed the fact that it overlooks most of the people in the United States in the interest of a limited group. The fact must also be taken into consideration that by the joint resolution we are increasing the Federal expenditure for relief purposes more than four times, but we are going to provide relief for less people, not for more people. In other words, 5,000,000 heads of families have been taken care of under the Relief Administration. We are turning over one and a half million unemployables to the States. That is being done under this plan, so that the number who are to be recipients either of work or of relief is less by a million and a half than under the present plan, and yet we are going to spend four times as much money. It is going to cost us $4 for relief where we now spend $1.

We are now handling the relief situation upon a monthly cost of approximately $25 per individual head of a family. It is the estimate that it will cost $100 per individual head of a family under this joint resolution. That is to say, instead of the expenditure of Federal funds by the Federal Relief Administration in 1934, amounting to $1,069,000,000, we propose to spend practically $5,000,000,000, and we do not propose to increase the number benefited except as they may be benefited through increased employment caused by the production of material to be used by the relief work.

Mr. President, this program is based upon a new theory of relief, and an abandonment of the existing theory. The present theory of relief is that the Government owes an obligation to its citizens to see that no man shall starve, that no man shall be cold or lack shelter. Relief has been given in proportion to needs. There are in my community individual cases where relief runs anywhere from $10 a month to $75 a month. A single man with some resources may get $10 and a man with a large family may get $75. His relief is based upon his necessities. We propose to abandon the rule of relief in accordance with necessities, and propose to put it upon a basis of wages, of employment.

The man in my town who is now getting $10, because that is all he needs, is to get a $50 job. The man who is now getting $75 will get a $50 job, too. In other words, they are to be paid in accordance with the work they do and not in accordance with their necessities. There is an abandonment of the basic theory of Federal relief.

That is a matter of real importance; and, mind you, it is a new theory. We are going to eliminate the depression by universal employment of all employables. We are going to pay them an average wage of $50 a month, regardless of their necessities, and based solely upon the work they do.

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

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

Mr. ADAMS. Gladly.

Mr. STEIWER. I know the Senator from Colorado does not desire to make an inaccurate statement. He has just stated that under this program we would eliminate unemployment. Is he not overlooking the other 5,000,000 unemployed who have not yet been reduced to the point where they are obliged to apply for relief?

Mr. ADAMS. I thank the Senator for correcting me. The situation is as he states. There are probably 7,000,000 employables who are unemployed and who are not upon relief. The joint resolution proposes to employ only those upon relief.

It is said, however, that relief under the present conditions is destructive of morale, is destructive of self-respect, is destructive of pride. We are going to put the needy man upon a wage basis, so that there will be no loss of self-respect, no loss of pride, in taking the relief employment. What does that mean? It means that the man among the 7,000,000 unemployed who has been fighting a desperate battle to keep off relief because of the loss of morale will now say, "There will be no loss of morale if I go on relief. There will be no loss of my pride." Therefore we will find the army of unemployed not on relief increasing, and instead of three and one-half million on relief we may have 10,000,000 on relief. That is to say, going on relief will not be objectionable any more. We are to make it attractive. So the number of three and a half million men will be augmented.

In addition to that, Mr. President, since we are going to provide work for three and a half million men, inevitably we are going to take away some work from those who are unemployed and not upon relief. That cannot be escaped. If we undertake any public projects, even such things as soil protection, we are going to give jobs to men on relief at the expense of men who have fought the battle to stay off relief.

I am not criticizing the man on relief. There are men on relief who are as fine citizens as exist in this land. There are men on relief who are as good as men in this body. On the other hand, I will say that the morale of the body of those on relief is not equal to that of the average of the 7,000,000 unemployed who have managed to stay off relief.

Not only are we establishing a new theory as to the administration of relief, but we are assuming a new, a continuing, and I think a perpetual obligation. We are saying that every man in the United States who is on relief shall have a job. We are guaranteeing a job at a security wage. That will not end at the end of the year, at the conclusion of the expenditure of this fund. If there should remain at that time a man unemployed upon relief, the Government is assuming the obligation to keep him employed—an obligation that no country in the world ever before undertook.

Senators may remember, I think in 1930, a battle in this body led by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. COSTIGAN] to get the Federal Government to recognize an obligation to give direct relief to needy citizens. The answer at that time was that it was not the duty of the Federal Government to provide direct relief, and the man in distress was told to go back to his State, to go back to his county, to go back to the Salvation Army. That has been changed. A new administration has come in, a new theory came in, and we recognize that if a country should say to its citizens in time of need, "You owe us your time, your service, and your life, if need be", that country owes to them an obligation to keep their flame of life burning in their time of distress. Following that, we have entered upon a tremendous program of direct relief and work relief.

Now, however, we are asked to go the next step and say, "Not only will we see that you are not in distress, but you shall have a job at the cost of the Federal Government." As I have said, with all the earnestness of which I am capable, it will destroy the credit of the Federal Government if that plan shall be carried out.

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

Mr. ADAMS. I yield.

Mr. CUTTING. I wonder why the Senator calls it a new theory. Does not the Senator recall the statement by President Roosevelt when running for office in 1932, "I believe in the inherent right of every citizen to employment at a living wage, and pledge my support to whatever means and measures may be necessary for inaugurating such public, self-liquidating work." Is not that exactly the theory which is embodied at the present time in the proposed legislation, and if so, why does the Senator speak of it as a new thing?

Mr. ADAMS. I speak of it as a new thing for this reason: the policy-making department of the United States Government is Congress, and Congress has never taken that stand before. Congress is now asked to take that stand. A President may have taken it, but it never has been the policy of the country, and I happen to be one of those with obsolete ideas who believe still that the policy-making department of the Government, the department which provides for the raising of the money and which spends it, is the Congress.

Mr. CUTTING. Mr. President, I do not want my position to be misconstrued. I quite agree with the Senator so far as that goes. All I meant was that I do not think the theory can be considered entirely new, when it was supported by the candidate of the Democratic Party for the Presidency, and was endorsed by most of those who supported him, whatever their previous political affiliations might have been.

Mr. ADAMS. May I say to the Senator from New Mexico that I am trying in the effort I am making, to follow the President of the United States. I am trying to support his administration. I am hoping to make it a success. I am hoping to help, and I hope that when the pages of history shall be written there will appear on them the statement that Roosevelt, President of the United States, brought his country out of the depression, rather than have it written that Roosevelt led his country into further calamity and catastrophe.

I am following, I may say to the Senator from New Mexico, the declarations of the Democratic national platform, which declared for economy. I am following the declaration of the President of the United States made on the 10th of March 1933, when he declared that the continued increase of deficits and debts was largely the cause of the distress in which our country found itself.

Mr. President, as I have said, there is this new continuing obligation which we cannot safely assume. Furthermore, I may say a further thing about the application of this new plan of giving every man a job. It is a fine thing that every man should have a job. Of course, the man who gets a dole, if it may be called that—and those who propose these amendments love to roll the word "dole" on their tongues as if the dole were some outrageous imposition upon the citizen—the citizen who is getting a dole is better off than the citizen who starves. The citizen who gets $50 a month, of course, is better off than the man who gets $25, and the man who would get $100 a month would be better off than the man who was getting $50, and we may go on and give a man $200 a month, and he would be better off. If we are to consider the matter pending here solely from the interest of the recipient of relief, of course, the larger the relief the more delighted and the better off the recipient would be.

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

Mr. ADAMS. Certainly.

Mr. ROBINSON. It is my understanding that the figures carried in the joint resolution are the approximate amount which will be necessary to accomplish the purpose of taking those on the relief rolls from the rolls and putting them into work-relief employment, and to perform other services which need not be mentioned in this connection, including the carrying on of emergency relief during the period immediately before us.

I should like to ask the Senator from Colorado upon what theory he bases his proposal to reduce the amount by one-half, and to fix the total appropriation at $2,000,000,000. Is it intended that the entire amount shall be employed in relieving destitution, or is a portion of it to be used in work relief, and if the latter, what portion? I should like to know how the Senator reaches the conclusion that the amount which he fixes in his amendment is the correct amount to be appropriated.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I am very glad to give to the Senator my views; I do not say my answer is the correct answer, but these are my views.

The joint resolution itself provides $4,880,000,000 and provides that the money may be expended any time up until June 30, 1937; in other words, nearly 2 years and a half from the time when the joint resolution was introduced.

The amendment which I have offered provides an appropriation of $2,880,000,000, or a reduction in amount of $2,000,000,000, and a reduction in the time within which it may be expended of 1 year. In other words, the amount provided by the amendment which I have offered would make possible larger payments per month than would be possible under the amount provided in the larger appropriation.

Mr. President, I am hoping to have work given to every man on relief. I am for work relief. At the present time work relief has been largely the policy of the Federal Emergency Relief Administration. Of the three and a half million employables on relief two and a quarter million have been at work. They have not been at work full time but they have been at work, and have worked to the extent of the amount of relief they have received. In other words, the man on relief could say, "Every dollar of relief which I received I earned."

The Federal Emergency Relief Administration was able in 1934 to give work relief to two and a quarter million people with the expenditure of $1,069,000,000. So the amendment which I have offered would give more than two and a half times as much Federal money as was used during 1934, under which more than two-thirds of those on relief were given employment. In other words, it would provide adequate money to give work relief to every man on relief, but not to guarantee him a job regardless of his necessities, and it would leave adequate money for reasonable public works, if you will.

Some 2 years ago we appropriated $3,300,000,000 for a great public-works program. Of that, roughly $300,000,000 went very promptly for naval expenditures, I understand. Of the remainder, not over one-half has yet been put into circulation in this country. There remains unexpended of this appropriation, roughly, a billion and a half after 2 years. So that my judgment is that if we appropriated $4,880,000,000, we could not put it out where it would be useful. We would be merely destroying Federal credit; we would be assuming a new continuing obligation, dangerous to the morale of the whole Nation. So that the money provided for in the amendment which I have offered is adequate for every fair work-relief program.

While we are talking of work relief, let me make this suggestion as to what we are planning to do under the pending measure; and, of course, the joint resolution must be considered in the light of the statements which have been made in its support by the President and the congressional leaders, because when we talk of security wages and projects we must realize they are not in the joint resolution, they are in the explanations of it. We are planning to take steel workers, shoemakers, carpenters, farmers, and put them to work on soil-erosion projects and reforestation projects. We are planning to put people to work at tasks with which they are not familiar, at which they are not skilled.

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

Mr. ADAMS. Certainly.

Mr. NORRIS. I am very much interested in what the Senator is saying, but it seems to me that the Senator's amendment would not change the theory of the joint resolution in any particular. It simply would cut down the amount and lessen the time within which it could be spent. The Senator's argument, however, is mostly against work relief and in favor of other methods of relief. Is the Senator intending to offer any other amendment, if the pending amendment shall prevail, to change at all the theory of the joint resolution?

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, I think the figures themselves will furnish the explanation; I do not think any other is necessary. As I said, we cannot put three and a half million men to work and give them $50 a month on a $2,000,000,000 appropriation.

In other words, in order to arrive at the basis of the $4,800,000,000 and to have the computation before the committee, we asked Admiral Peoples and also Mr. Bell, the Acting Director of the Budget, "How did you arrive at the $4,000,000,000 figure? Did you have any projects in mind?"

"No." "Did you have any particular computation?" "No." "Well, what did you do?" "Well", they said, "we figured there were three and one-half million men we were going to put to work and pay them, on the average, $50 a month. That means $2,100,000,000. And we figured it will take $1,900,000,000 for material. So we reached this computation by figuring what it would cost us to put three and one-half million men to work at $50 a month."

If we provide only $2,000,000,000, we cannot put that many men to work and pay them $50 a month. That is, there are limitations in the figures themselves. Work relief is a very different thing from putting people upon the Government pay roll, employing them at a wage. I am in favor of work relief. I am not in favor of the United States employing every unemployed man in the United States on Government work.

Mr. NORRIS. If the Senator will permit me to interrupt him, I will say that it seems to me the Senator's amendment will not do what he says it will do. It will only lessen the number of men who could be put to work, and shorten the time at which they could work. Those who have to carry out the administrative features of the joint resolution would not necessarily be affected at all by the Senator's amendment, it seems to me, except that they would not do as much as they would do if the amendment were not agreed to.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, apparently I have been unable to make myself clear. The President of the United States has put into effect a relief policy which has been in operation for some 2 years. I am in favor of the President's policy. I believe it is sound; I believe it should be continued. I am a supporter of the policy of the President of the United States as put into effect and carried out in 1933 and 1934. I am not in favor of repudiating the policies of the President of the United States under which we have been making headway. In other words, I am in favor of giving to every unemployed man in this country who is in distress relief to the extent of his necessities, and to provide him work, so that his pride, his self-respect, may be saved; so that he may work and earn that relief. I am not in favor of the Government assuming the obligation to give men jobs, pay them a so-called "security wage", the wage to be entirely independent of their necessities, and that all they have to do to get the job is to say, "We are in need to some degree."

When interrupted I was starting to point out an idea which is somewhat incomplete in my own mind. We are proposing to take steelworkers, cement mixers, shoemakers, textile workers, away from the jobs at which they are skilled and to put them to work at jobs at which they are not skilled. Not only that, but the kind of work we are proposing to provide for them is work which is not competitive with other industry, work which is not productive. In other words, we are going to take the man who can be made a producing citizen and put him at some task for which he is not fitted. It will help him, yes; but my inquiry is whether that is the best way to go about it. We have men, women, and children in the United States in need of shoes. When we have idle shoemakers, would it not be better to put them to work at making shoes instead of putting them to work on a soil-erosion project? On the farms, plows and other farm implements of steel are needed. Why should the steelworker in my town be put out on a forestation project when he could be making plows and other farm implements at his regular place of employment? People need houses. Why should we put carpenters to work on reforestation projects when they could be put to work at their accustomed occupation? People need shoes. Why should the shoemaker not be put at his accustomed work rather than on a soil-erosion project? The farmer has a surplus of crop, and he needs shoes, he needs farm implements, and he needs carpenter work.

Why do we have to go about it in the indirect way? We say we are going to put men to work indirectly. How? A man is assigned to the task of building a grade crossing at some place. He is going to use some material, the production of which will put a brickmaker or somebody else to work. Why can we not put people to work on their own jobs where they can be productive? Why do we have to go in a round-about way and waste three-fourths of what we do? Why can we not put the steel worker to work in the steel mill? Why can we not put the carpenter to work building houses? Why can we not put the shoemaker to work at making shoes? I do not know the answer, but I do know that of the various groups there is hardly a man among unemployed group who does not need something which can be produced by someone else in that very group.

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

Mr. ADAMS. Certainly.

Mr. NORRIS. In answer to the Senator's questions which he has propounded—all proper questions, I concede—I will ask the Senator, does he think we will put the steel worker to work making steel and put the shoemaker to work making shoes if we shall adopt his amendment?

Mr. ADAMS. No; but I will say to the Senator from Nebraska that if we take $4,880,000,000 and use it for direct employment, we will do infinitely better with it if we go to the detail which can be gone into of seeing that the money is spent directly to put people to work on their own jobs. We have a great industrial machine. It is stalled. It is a good machine. We have the wealth; we have the man power; we have the need for things which can be produced. We have the capacity to produce them. My inquiry is, if we want to start this stalled machine, had we not better put on the machine the crew which understands how to work it? Are we not more apt to have it started in that way than if we put people at work on the various parts who do not understand the job on which they are engaged? In other words, I think we are going at this problem in a left-handed, a backward way. We have been doing it for 2 years; we have made some headway, but we are not out of the woods as yet.

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

Mr. ADAMS. I yield.

Mr. BORAH. I know the Senator has given this subject much more consideration than I have, and that he knows far more about the effect of his amendment than I do, but I am unable as yet to understand how the amendment as now proposed, limiting the time to 1 year and cutting the appropriation down $2,000,000,000, will effectuate what the Senator desires to accomplish. How does it change the program? The Senator proposes simply to limit the expenditure to 1 year and to cut down the amount $2,000,000,000. How does it change the program as it would be under the $4,000,000,000 plan extending over 2 years instead of 1 year?

Mr. ADAMS. As the Senator from Idaho knows, there was no program pointed out in the joint resolution as it originally came to us. It merely provided for an appropriation of a vast sum of money and the delegation of vast power. What we understand as to the security wage program is derived from explanations as to why the money is needed. In the previous appropriation bill, for instance, the one passed, I think, on June 16 of last year, we merely appropriated a large sum of money. We created a Federal Emergency Relief Administration. The sum of money itself points to some limitations. I am perfectly frank in saying to the Senator from Idaho that if the President of the United States, under the reduced appropriation, should insist on putting into effect a security wage-employment program, he could do so, but he could not do that and successfully provide relief for all the people. In other words, the amendment inevitably and necessarily imposes limitations upon the method by which the money is spent, and points out clearly the fact that we prefer a work-relief program to a wage-employment program.

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

Mr. ADAMS. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. FLETCHER. The Senator has argued that we have had a fund of this character for 2 years and have not been able to get that money into circulation; that we have not been able to complete the work during 2 years. How does he propose by his amendment to advantage anything by making the limitation 1 year? It seems to me we will scarcely get started on the program in 1 year.

Mr. ADAMS. We must not confuse the two things. The money which has not gone out is the money that went to the Public Works Administration. The money which we turned over to the Federal Emergency Relief Administration has been disbursed. Those are two different agencies, two different plans of expenditures.

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

Mr. ADAMS. I yield.

Mr. BYRNES. I understand the Senator to say that of the $3,300,000,000 appropriated, one-half had not been spent.

Mr. ADAMS. I will say that approximately one-half of the money has not gone out into the country. The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], I think, has the figures available and will present the accurate figures.

Mr. BYRNES. May I say to the Senator that the statement from the Treasury will show that, on the basis of checks issued, of the $3,300,000,000, there was a balance of $1,116,000,000, but of that amount $869,245,000 has been contracted for? Thus there remain only $247,000,000 available for further obligation, and of that amount, as the Senator knows, we have withdrawn considerable sums to be transferred to F. E. R. A., but the amount undisbursed, on the basis of checks actually issued, amounts to only $1,116,000,000, and $869,000,000 of that is obligated.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. ADAMS. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. In connection with what the Senator from South Carolina has stated, it is true that there is $1,100,000,000 unexpended from the $3,300,000,000; but the total unexpended balance available for public works from all sources, according to a statement which has come to me from the Secretary of the Treasury, amounts to $1,463,735,845.57. So there is a total already appropriated of approximately $1,500,000,000 available in the Treasury for expenditure on public works at the present time.

Mr. BYRNES. I will not interrupt the Senator's speech further.

Mr. ADAMS. I may say to the Senator that my speech is not of the kind that can be distressed by an interruption.

Mr. President, I have tried to point out why I thought the theory of this measure was unsound.

The other item is the element of cost. Considering that the theory of the joint resolution is sound, that the security wage is desirable, my studies of the finances of the Government persuade me that if we enter upon this expenditure in the total sum proposed we will endanger the credit of the United States.

Again I fall back upon the Democratic leader for my text. Also, on February 23, 1935, as quoted in the New York Times, he said:

> It is impossible for the Federal Government long to carry out a program for a Nation-wide dole or a public employment system.

My judgment is that this program involves a long, Nation-wide public employment system which the Senator from Arkansas says it is impossible for the Treasury of the United States to carry.

The President of the United States in his message of March 10, 1933, laid down a statement of facts and of principles. At that time he said:

> For 3 long years the Federal Government has been on the road toward bankruptcy.
>
> For the fiscal year 1931 the deficit was $462,000,000.
>
> For the fiscal year 1932 it was $2,472,000,000.
>
> For the fiscal year 1933 it will probably exceed $1,200,000,000.
>
> For the fiscal year 1934, based on the appropriations bills passed by the last Congress and the estimated revenues, the deficit will probably exceed $1,000,000,000 unless immediate action is taken.
>
> Thus we shall have piled up an accumulated deficit of $5,000,000,000.
>
> With the utmost seriousness I point out to the Congress the profound effect of this fact upon our national economy. It has contributed to the recent collapse of our banking structure. It has accentuated the stagnation of the economic life of our people. It has added to the ranks of the unemployed. Our Government's house is not in order, and for many reasons no effective action has been taken to restore it to order.
>
> Upon the unimpaired credit of the United States Government rests the safety of deposits, the security of insurance policies, the activity of industrial enterprises, the value of our agricultural products, and the availability of employment. The credit of the United States Government definitely affects these fundamental human values. It therefore becomes our first concern to make secure the foundation. National recovery depends upon it.
>
> Too often in recent history liberal governments have been wrecked on rocks of loose fiscal policy. We must avoid this danger.

Mr. President, that is exactly where I stand. The President of the United States pointed out that a deficit of $5,000,000,000, at a time when the indebtedness of the United States was only $21,000,000,000 at the outside, was endangering the national credit. What is the situation today?

The national indebtedness, Mr. President, is, roughly, $35,000,000,000. In making up that figure there are included the conceded obligations of some twenty-eight and a half billion dollars, the bonus obligation, due in 1945 or 1947, of, roughly, $2,000,000,000, which is an indebtedness, and unexpended allocated appropriated funds awaiting only the action of the administrative authority of some $5,000,000,000. Those funds appropriated and unexpended are not debts as yet, but they are prospective debts; they are on their way to become debts. In other words, we have a real indebtedness facing us of $35,000,000,000.

The President estimates a deficit of four and a half billion dollars this year and an equal amount next year. We are on the road to an indebtedness on the part of this country of $50,000,000,000. If the national credit was in danger when the indebtedness was $21,000,000,000, and when the deficit was $5,000,000,000; and if, as the President says, unemployment, the collapse of our banking structure, and the lowering of industrial activity were due to that course toward bankruptcy, what is to be said today?

Mind you, Mr. President, the income of the United States Government, excluding processing taxes, as to which the Federal Government is merely a collecting agency, in the fiscal year 1934 was $2,700,000,000. We propose to appropriate in one bill almost twice the total national income for a year. We are running behind so rapidly that our income today is only about 37 cents on each dollar of expenditures. Is it not time to take warning; and is it not time to regard what the President of the United States said to us in 1933 when he entered upon a program which has brought us far on the road to recovery?

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

Mr. ADAMS. Certainly.

Mr. TYDINGS. Is there any Senator in this body who supposes that at the end of the next 2 years, when all this money shall have been expended, a great deal of the problem which exists today will not then exist; and will those Senators who are going to vote for this $4,800,000,000 appropriation be prepared, at the end of 2 years, to vote for another appropriation of three or four billion dollars?

Mr. BORAH. Let me ask the Senator from Maryland a question.

Mr. TYDINGS. If it is agreeable to the Senator from Colorado, I will be glad to answer if I can.

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

Mr. ADAMS. Certainly.

Mr. BORAH. The Senator from Maryland has asked a very pertinent question, but, in view of the situation now confronting us of unemployment and many people on the relief rolls, the question is, What are we going to do about it? They must be thought of; and it will take at least a very large sum of money in order to meet that situation. I am not prepared to suggest any exact amount, but there must necessarily be a large sum of money supplied. I see no way to avoid these expenditures; I wish I could.

Mr. TYDINGS. I agree with the Senator that people in distress should not be allowed to starve if they are the victims of an economic depression. My way to provide for them would be to give them enough to live on until the country can get back on its feet, and not put the Government further in debt by providing work, which will simply add to the national debt, delay recovery, and, to a large extent, be a waste of governmental money. Does that answer the Senator?

Mr. BORAH. That presents one view of it very ably.

Mr. TYDINGS. Well, that is my view of it.

Mr. ADAMS. May I suggest that if we have impaired the national credit we can then no longer give either relief or employment? In other words, when the national credit is jeopardized, then we have unemployment without means to meet it. We have gotten into the habit of talking of large figures until we cease to understand what is really involved in them. Millions have become as pennies.

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

Mr. ADAMS. Certainly.

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not know whether the Senator cares to answer my question, but may I ask him—because I am in sympathy with the general theme of his remarks—if he does not feel that in 2 years a great deal of the unemployment problem as it exists today will be with us again; and how long are we going to take money which we have not got to use for a purpose such as this? How long can we take money—2, 3, or 4 billion dollars a year—and appropriate it to a condition which, in my judgment, is permanent? With high tariffs, with a failure to trade with the world, and with a currency war going on, I think that the unemployment situation is just as permanent as is Gibraltar; and if we are going to run the country that way, we might as well make up our minds that we are going to have to appropriate public funds year after year for people who will have no work in that kind of a society.

Mr. ADAMS. Let me call the attention of the Senator from Maryland to the three authorities on whom I am relying. The gentleman who first induced me to enter upon a study of this situation was the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS].

Mr. TYDINGS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. ADAMS. I was somewhat amazed at some figures he produced, and I undertook to study them.

The next authority is the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], whom I regard as an authority on all these fiscal questions.

The next was the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON], who has said to us, if we should adopt the McCarran amendment, which involved, according to his figures, roughly, an additional expenditure of $2,000,000,000, that we would destroy the credit of the United States. We have gotten that close to the brink. I have heard other Senators speak of the bonus and say that if $2,000,000,000 shall be spent for that purpose, we shall be ruined. Those things have been said in the past when our indebtedness was far less than it is now, so that it seems to me that the question of the Senator from Maryland answers itself largely, that is, we cannot continue to spend beyond the point of safe credit. Now let me give a figure or two.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President——

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

Mr. ADAMS. I yield.

Mr. BORAH. I take it from the argument that is being advanced that we cannot think of enacting a law to take care of old-age pensions or of the bonus? And yet those matters must have consideration.

Mr. ADAMS. That would be the natural conclusion of some of the arguments which have been made.

Mr. BORAH. That would be the natural conclusion, I take it, of the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. ADAMS. I will state to the Senator from Idaho that I am personally in favor of saving a little money so that we may do some of those things.

Mr. BORAH. That is sound doctrine.

Mr. GLASS. What is the use of saving money and then proceeding to waste it?

Mr. BORAH. I was speaking seriously. The bonus bill is coming to the Senate, and, in all probability, will be passed. Old-age pension legislation also is coming to the Senate, and there is a probability that old-age pension legislation will be passed. The argument which is being presented here this morning would preclude the consideration of those matters from the standpoint of the credit of the Government. The question with me is are we to take a position in advance of their consideration which would seem to preclude their enactment.

Mr. ADAMS. If the Senator from Idaho will permit me to make this comment, I am quite convinced that the credit of the Government can stand certain definite appropriations if that is the end. My point is that we are starting a process, and that it is a continuing process which will lead us into debt beyond our capacity to stand.

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

Mr. ADAMS. Certainly.

Mr. TYDINGS. I doubt very much if an appropriation of $5,000,000,000 is going to wreck the credit of the Government.

If we add $2,000,000,000 more for the bonus, I doubt very much whether we will wreck the credit of the Government. As I understand, the Senator from Colorado does not contend that to be the case. What he does contend, however, is that each one of these appropriations, which are large, tends to the point where sooner or later Government credit must be wrecked unless we lay taxes to keep down the debt.

With the banks already holding half of the Government indebtedness, of course the banks are going to buy the $7,000,000,000 worth of new obligations, because if they do not buy them, the bonds they already hold would drop in value, and then the credit of the banks would be impaired.

What I am wondering is how much further we can go in these leaps—not slow walking steps, but these financial leaps—before we reach the point where the Government credit will be wrecked. It may be $40,000,000,000, it may be $50,000,000,000, but let me point out that $7,000,000,000 is one-seventh of $50,000,000,000, and the bonus plus the public relief measure now before us will amount to $7,000,000,000. In my judgment, both these measures are going to pass. If $50,000,000,000 is the limit of our credit, and there is not a man here who can say that 2 years from now we will not need appropriations of this kind again, then I say how can we afford to think that $50,000,000,000 is the limit and go ahead and spend $7,000,000,000 of it in a single year when we already have a national debt of $30,000,000,000.

Mr. BORAH. I observe the question of the credit of the Government is always invoked against a measure to which the party invoking it is opposed. The McCarran amendment was defeated largely because the credit of the Government was supposed to be involved and near exhaustion. A very small sum, comparatively speaking, was involved. I suppose an effort will be made to defeat the bonus on the same theory.

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not think the bonus will be defeated, may I say to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. BORAH. Then we had better save something out of this measure for it.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is the point I am making. If we are going to spend this $4,883,000,000, and then the week following we are going to appropriate $2,500,000,000, and then in a year or two more we are going to appropriate $4,000,000,000 or $5,000,000,000, all of which we have not, all of which we are borrowing, with no one willing to lay the taxes to carry on such an extravagant program, I want to know how long we can run the Government that way before people reach the conclusion that it is not being well run.

Mr. BORAH. Has the Senator read the hearings containing the testimony of Governor Eccles before the House committee?

Mr. TYDINGS. Only sporadically.

Mr. BORAH. He purports to make answer to the Senator's argument on that point.

Mr. TYDINGS. I have not that information.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, there are certain things this country needs. I think the primary thing is to get its people who are unemployed back to work in their jobs in private industry. We need to have private industry become active, undertake its normal business operations, and absorb the unemployment. What is necessary in order that that may be accomplished? The unemployed man does not need to be encouraged to take a job. The man on relief is eager for work. The man who needs encouragement is the man who

has a job which he can give to somebody. We need to encourage industry, commerce, and business. If we are going to get people to work in industry, commerce, and business we have got to let them understand that conditions are secure, that there is an opportunity for profit in their undertakings.

Whenever a man with means is only concerned with saving that which he has, we have unemployment. We must have in that man's mind a feeling that conditions are sufficiently secure and sufficiently attractive so that he may earn a profit out of the employment of his capital, with his factory, or with his undertaking in commerce.

We cannot encourage industry and capital and commerce by piling up debts which threaten the credit of the country. If we continue to increase the deficit, if we exhibit to the country unsound financial policies leading inevitably to repudiation or inflation, we will not secure that which America needs above all other things.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. ADAMS. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Along the line of the thought the Senator has been expressing, trying to keep men in the trades in which normally they work, I wonder if the Senator would bear with me for a moment to permit me to put a brief summary in the RECORD which shows the distribution of positions in the country as to industry?

Mr. ADAMS. Would not the Senator rather do that in his own time?

Mr. TYDINGS. It is not long, and it has a direct bearing on the point the Senator is just making.

Mr. ADAMS. Very well; the Senator may proceed.

Mr. TYDINGS. In 1930, of workers over 10 years of age, there were gainfully employed 41,000,000. I shall give only the round numbers. Of these, 10,600,000 were engaged in agriculture, 270,000 in forestry and fishing, 1,000,000 in extracting minerals, 12,800,000 in manufacturing and mechanical industries, 3,000,000 in transportation, 4,200,000 in trade, 700,000 in public-service work, 2,000,000 in professional service, 3,300,000 in domestic and personal service, and 3,000,000 in clerical occupations. These figures include both male and female.

When we consider what we can do in this matter, I think the normal activities of the persons ordinarily engaged in work in the country ought to be considered.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I have a few figures which I desire to offer. First, I want to have the Senate understand that the appropriation provided for by the amendment is an enormous appropriation. It is not a trivial appropriation. It is really larger than any relief appropriation ever made. The $3,300,000,000 public-works appropriation was not strictly a relief appropriation. It is almost equal to the total capital, surplus, and undivided profits of all the national banks of the United States. I merely cite that to give some idea of the amount that is proposed to be appropriated by the amendment. It is equal, Mr. President and Senators, to the capital, surplus, and undivided profits of all the national banks of the United States and we think of the national-banking system as an institution of some size. It is in excess of the total revenues of the United States in 1934.

Let me give some statistics from the Budget message of January 1935: For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1934, the expenses of the Government were $7,100,000,000; the revenues were $2,700,000,000; the deficit was $4,000,000,000, the increase in the national debt was $4,500,000,000. That is, the national debt increased one and one-half times the total income for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1934.

For the fiscal year 1935 the Budget estimates are as follows: Expenditures, $8,500,000,000; receipts, $3,100,000,000; deficit, $4,800,000,000; and the national debt will be $31,800,000,000, which does not include the bonus or unexpended appropriations.

For the fiscal year to end June 30, 1936, these figures also coming from the Budget estimate, the deficit is estimated at $4,500,000,000, and the national debt at $40,000,000,000. Again we have to add the other figures which I have mentioned.

How does that compare with the national debts of other days? In 1916 the national debt was $1,225,000,000. In 1919, the high point at the close of the war, the national debt was $25,400,000,000; and let me remind Senators that about that time, or shortly thereafter, Government bonds went down upon the markets 10, 15, and 20 points. If Government bonds went down under a national debt of $25,000,000,000, it may be predicted what may happen when the national debt reaches forty or forty-five billion dollars.

In 1931 the national debt had been reduced until it had reached $16,800,000,000. When this administration went into office it had reached probably $21,000,000,000. We are now in the process of doubling the national debt of the United States.

At the close of the Civil War, when there was question as to the stability of the Government under its load of debt, the total Government indebtedness then was only $2,750,000,000. At that time the Government had issued so-called "greenbacks" to the amount of only $450,000,000, yet they depreciated to 35 cents on the dollar. Government bonds about that time depreciated until they could be bought at 32 cents on the dollar. Government bonds did not reach par for a period of 15 years after the Civil War; neither did the Government credit upon its greenbacks reach par until the passage of the Resumption Act in 1878.

These things are history. We have seen Government credit impaired. We know what it has meant to business; but we are going on, on, on, spending not only great sums but unnecessary sums. That is my complaint about this joint resolution. We can take care of the needy with $2,880,000,000. The $4,880,000,000, the excess of $2,000,000,000, is not needed.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. ADAMS. Certainly.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Has the Senator from Colorado figures showing how the national debt increased during the administration of President Hoover? If not, would it not be well to place in the RECORD the year-by-year increase in the national debt, beginning with the present depression?

Mr. ADAMS. They are available, though they are not on my table. I should be very glad to furnish them. I was trying to avoid more statistics than seemed pertinent to the discussion, but I shall be glad to incorporate them in my remarks.

In addition to these direct obligations we have contingent obligations. The Government has guaranteed the Home Owners' Loan bonds. It has guaranteed the Farm Mortgage Corporation bonds. Its name is upon the Federal Reserve notes of three billion and something. It has guaranteed the Housing Corporation's bonds. It is behind the T. V. A. It is behind the R. F. C., and the obligations of the R. F. C. are unlimited in several respects, whatever may be needed. I think the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], who has had a hand in these pieces of legislation, knows that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is required to provide whatever funds are needed by the Housing Administration and by several others, and the R. F. C. gets it by borrowing upon the credit of the United States. Then we have the postal savings, which are secured largely by Government obligations.

Interest on the public debt is now approaching $1,000,000,000 a year. At the present time it is something less than that, because the short-time borrowings of the Government are made at extremely low rates; but that may not continue. The average rate, however, upon Government borrowings, even with the low-rate, short-time borrowing is practically 3 percent. It has been going down. When our indebtedness reaches, as it apparently soon will reach, the $40,000,000,000 point, we shall be paying out a billion and a quarter dollars a year in interest—a billion and a quarter out of a total income of $3,000,000,000. That is a fixed charge; and, in addition to that, some day we shall be called upon to pay the principal.

In addition to the national indebtedness, there bears down upon the taxpayer of the land the city, the school, the

county, and the State debts, and they aggregate today over $20,000,000,000. In other words, our total national indebtedness which the taxpayer must carry is now over $50,000,000,000. Today practically 37 percent of the income of the country is consumed in taxes. The per capita Federal debt is nearly $250. The total per capita public indebtedness of all kinds runs over $400; and, mind you, when we figure that we must forget the men on relief, the unemployed. We must think of those who have to pay it. We must think that when we say "per capita", they average four to four and a half per family, so that every family in the United States that has any earnings has a burden of anywhere from $1,600 to $2,500 of indebtedness to carry.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Mr. President——

Mr. ADAMS. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Has my able colleague drawn attention to the fact that in 1919 the Federal debt aggregated approximately $25,482,000,000, and that by 1930, following the World War, by retirement of portions of the debt, it had reached a low level of about $16,185,000,000?

Mr. ADAMS. I gave substantially those figures sometime ago.

Now I come to the total bank deposits, simply to give some more figures, so that Senators may understand the magnitude of the thing. The total bank deposits of the United States, excluding interbank deposits—that is, excluding those bank deposits which duplicate, and counting only the actual deposits in all the banks of the United States—are $42,000,000,000. In other words, our indebtedness is rapidly approaching the point where it would take all the bank deposits in the United States to pay our debt.

Of the national debt, the banks of the country hold $15,500,000,000. In other words, more than one-third of the deposits of the banks are invested in Government bonds. What does that mean? If there should be an impairment, even a slight impairment, of Government credit, if trouble should come to the banks, what would it mean to business, to industry, and to the man seeking employment?

The total capital, surplus, and undivided profits of all the banks, State, National, and others, is less than half of the amount invested in Government bonds. That is, we are putting on the banks a great part of the Government burden. There is one statement which has been made here a couple of times which is slightly in excess of the computations I make. It is said that a 10-percent shrinkage in Government bonds would render insolvent all the banks. I cannot verify that statement from the statistics. I say that because I think it is rather unfortunate to exaggerate our financial dangers. In other words, if there were a 10-percent drop in $15,000,000,000 worth of bonds which the banks of the country hold, they would have a shrinkage of a billion and a half. That would consume only half of their surpluses and undivided profits, and would not impair their capital. Of course, it does not mean that many banks would not be rendered insolvent, because these are aggregate figures. I merely want to give such encouragement as I can.

I now come to the tax situation; and that is what this entire matter comes down to—Who pays the bill? We propose to spend $5,000,000,000 under this joint resolution, and we spend other billions for other purposes. Who pays the bill? I know there is apparently a theory that the money comes down as manna did in the wilderness, that nobody has to produce it. The States today are talking of projects that they have. My State in the past 2 weeks has conjured up over $300,000,000 in projects. They have been gathered in. Apparently, there is a program of encouraging and stimulating the sending in of projects.

My State represents 1 percent of the country. If we get our $300,000,000 the Government is going to have to spend $30,000,000,000, if the money is distributed fairly—and, of course, Colorado would not have anything other than fairness. Of this $5,000,000,000 expense bill Colorado's 1 percent would mean $50,000,000 that we have to pay. Our people do not think of that. They do not seem to realize that the only source of the payment of these debts is the States, the citizens of the States, the taxpayers of the States. We have thirty to thirty-five billion dollars of indebtedness, which on my State means an indebtedness today of $350,000,000. Do Senators think that if my people realized that, they would be telegraphing me to support this joint resolution to spend more money for a lot of unnecessary, unproductive projects?

Mr. President, I am perfectly well aware that economy is unpopular. Any man who is seeking votes, who is seeking success at the polls, should not go out and preach economy. I have tried to follow the declaration of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] that patriotism should rule in this matter; and my judgment of the welfare of my country at this time, regardless of its effect upon any of the rest of us, is that this joint resolution, and the policy which it seeks to inaugurate, will endanger the future of my country.

Just a word or two more and I shall conclude.

My judgment is that before the introduction of the measure we were well on our way out of the depression. I think the establishment of sound-banking conditions, the relieving of the home owners and the farmers from loans at excessive rates of interest, and many other things that have been done had started us out of the depression, and we were making headway. I know that in my State conditions were better. Our mines were better. Our cattlemen were beginning to feel better. Agriculture, in some areas outside the drought area, was better. The merchant was doing better, and other things were improving; but today they are frightened at the prospect of financial recklessness. That is true of all those to whom we must look for employment.

Mr. President, in my judgment, this joint resolution is an unwarranted confession of the failure of the national administration's policy. I think the policy has been a success; and when we set about to repudiate the very policy under which we have been operating for 2 years I think it is an undeserved confession that we have failed and that we must turn and go another way. I think we have been on the right track, and I think we were going on. I think the President's message of warning as to expenditures should be blazoned where all can read it.

Supporting that joint resolution, of course, are the relief workers. They, of course, are for its passage. I have received telegrams from relief workers. If I were a relief worker, of course I would rather have $50 than $25. The contractors want the joint resolution passed. The communities that have projects as to which they have thought, "Well, we never can afford them ourselves", now think the Federal Government is going to build them, and they want the joint resolution passed. If we put it through and start on this course of building needless projects and spending money needlessly, I hesitate to prophesy the consequences.

As I have said to the Senate, in my judgment the joint resolution is unsound in its theory.

I think it introduces a dangerous new policy, a continuing obligation. I think that having gotten as far as we have we should follow the policy of a good doctor. When a patient is in desperate condition they give him stimulants, or they give him narcotics, as the case may be. When the patient shows signs of recovery they do not continue to load him with stimulants or with narcotics. In this Nation we show strong and marked signs of recovery. Why should we continue to inject narcotics, why should we continue to inject stimulants? What we need is the natural, normal course of recovery. If we are not careful we will have a land which depends upon narcotics, and we know what that means.

Mr. President, people speak lightly of indebtedness; they seem to think it is fine. We borrow today, and we do not think of pay day.

Senators, this depression owes its origin, more than to any other one thing, to excessive borrowing, excessive lending, excessive spending, speculation, and waste. Everyone here knows men in his State, in his community, who were prosperous a few years ago, but who are broken men, physically as well as financially, due to the fact that they speculated and borrowed beyond their abiilty to pay.

In 1927, 1928, and 1929 we pledged the incomes, the earnings, which we expected to get in 1930, 1931, and 1932 to buy things in those years, and when the incomes ceased there was nothing with which to buy, there was no one to whom to sell.

We have had an experience in lending. There is an uncollectible $11,000,000,000 item representing money we loaned to Europe. We took $11,000,000,000 of good money of the taxpayers out of this country through Government loans. We lost $17,000,000,000 in private loans to Europe and South America. Yet we wonder why distress fell upon us.

Our capital resources have been impaired in that way. A country brought into distress and depression by reckless borrowing on the part of its citizens seems to think it can as a nation get out of the depression by doing the same thing that brought the country into distress. Borrowing never got any country out of a depression. If we will study the history of depressions, we will find that, without a single exception, recovery has never been secured through government wasteful borrowing or wasteful spending. I do not say that upon my own authority, but speaking to an eminent historian only a few nights ago, I asked him as to that matter, and that was his answer.

The course we are pursuing is a false course. We are near enough to the edge of the precipice, according to leaders, so that an additional $2,000,000,000 might send us over. Yet we are asked to enter upon and to follow a course which may mean five, ten, fifteen, twenty billion dollars of borrowings.

Mr. President, it seems to me that the pending joint resolution hazards the future of America upon the turn of one card. We are told that if we will pass it, it will break the backbone of the depression and all will go back to work. If there were any way of guaranteeing the fulfillment of that prospect I should be glad to vote for the joint resolution, but, as I have said, it hazards the future of our country, the country of those who are to come after us, to whom we owe still greater obligations, upon the turn of a single card, upon the events of a single year, and I for one feel unable to support any such course.

I wish to close by again reading what the President of the United States said in the message of March 10, 1933:

> Upon the unimpaired credit of the United States Government rest the safety of deposits, the security of insurance policies, the activity of industrial enterprises, the value of our agricultural products, and the availability of employment. The credit of the United States Government definitely affects these fundamental human values. It therefore becomes our first concern to make secure the foundation. National recovery depends upon it.
>
> Too often in recent history liberal governments have been wrecked on rocks of loose fiscal policy. We must avoid this danger.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5255) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice and for the Judiciary, and for the Departments of Commerce and Labor, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 5255) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice and for the Judiciary, and for the Departments of Commerce and Labor, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

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.

WORK-RELIEF PLAN

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 117) making appropriations for relief purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ADAMS].

INCREASING DOLES INCREASE THE CHAOS

Mr. SCHALL. Mr. President, in June 1933, when the new deal began with a Federal dole system of so-called "relief and recovery", the total number of people on public relief were 17,000,000. After increasing the public debt by billions and piling up accumulated deficits approximating $11,000,000,000, Uncle Sam finds on his public relief rolls today 22,375,000 persons.

In other words, increasing doles, increasing debt, and increasing deficits have resulted in adding 5,000,000 people to public relief rolls. They also, by the destructive cooperation of such new-deal nostrums as the N. R. A. and the A. A. A., have added 1,000,000 to the number of unemployed in the industrial centers, not to mention a further increase of 2,000,000 unemployed in the rural districts.

In other words, the more we drain the financial resources of the United States Treasury, and the farther away we drift from a balanced Budget and national solvency, the larger grows the army of the public charges and the unemployed.

The greatest obstacle to recovery of our industrial prosperity is the growing threat of this leaning tower of Pisa, built of debts, doles, and deficits, which now overhangs every constructive enterprise—industrial, transportation, utility, commerce, and agriculture.

The road to recovery and permanent relief lies in cutting down, not in piling up, the doles, debts, and deficits, which block national recovery.

Increasing doles and deficits are destroying public confidence and industrial initiative, the foundation source of employment.

Increasing public debt is followed by an increasing interest burden, which already exceeds total receipts from income taxes.

Today, while public debt and bond investment stand at $10,000,000,000 above 1932, the loans to industry are $3,000,000,000 less than in 1932, and the sales of industrial and utility shares in 1934 fell to 100,000,000 less than in 1932.

In short, we are destroying the industries that employ labor and pay the taxes for support of government. And we are erecting a centralized Federal Government which threatens the perpetuity of the Republic.

Today, no man knows whether the end shall be a one-man dictatorship, as in Rome and Berlin, or a Soviet bureaucracy, as in Russia, or another American revolution. Only one thing is plain, this daily drift from the Constitution, from the American regime of common sense and common honesty, is carrying us farther away from the foundation on which we have achieved the greatness of the past 146 years, and threatens the United States with the eventual relapse like that we behold abroad.

We hear the boast that the Senate of the United States is the greatest parliamentary body on earth. We are faced with the problem, Shall government of the people, by the people, and for the people perish from the earth? Here true democracy is making its last stand. Shall we here, in our votes on this $4,000,000,000 Executive demand, vote for true recovery and democracy, or vote for increased dictatorship, doles, debt, and deficits?

It was said by a one-time great Democrat:

> The way to retrench is to retrench.

A vote to cut this $4,000,000,000 lump to actual needs of $1,880,000,000 is retrenchment. It means a marked step in the recovery of public confidence, industrial enterprise, increased employment, expanding production and prosperity, and a stride toward the recovery of all that has made America great—American freedom.

A vote to further expand the debt, deficits, and doles by piling on top of the leaning tower another $4,000,000,000, "subject to the allocation of the Executive", means continued and increasing emergency and depression, until finally we are reduced to the status of Rome, Berlin, and Moscow.

The true road to recovery is plain:

First. Retrench by reducing the $4,000,000,000 to $1,880,000,000, to restore public confidence.

Second. Repeal the N. R. A., which in itself will add to pay rolls of "crack downed" industry the 1,000,000 which the N. R. A. has thrown to unemployment.

Third. Repeal the A. A. A., which has added 1,000,000 to unemployment in the cotton South and another 1,000,000 unemployed in the North and West.

If this first session of the Seventy-fourth Congress should accomplish these three major measures of retrenchment and reform, we shall be able to balance our Budget by 1937, confidence will return, and America will be herself again.

Mr. HAYDEN obtained the floor.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURKE in the chair). Eighty-eight Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I desire to address the Senate on the question of whether the enactment of the pending legislation would tend to destroy or impair the credit of the United States.

We can be of good cheer. Economic conditions in the United States are not so bad as they have been painted. The credit of the United States is sound, and will be maintained. We do not have to believe all we hear or all we read in the newspapers. Some editorial writers have all the mental attributes of "Gloomy Gus", who was at one time quite prominent in the comic strips, but they only repeat unfounded forebodings.

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

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

Mr. TYDINGS. I shall not interrupt the Senator any further; but I wish to make a suggestion in the light of his observation. I understand that this joint resolution provides for work for three and a half million men. There are 12,000,000 unemployed. I think it would be a good idea to make the proposed appropriation $16,000,000,000 to take care of them all; to give every man out of work a chance to work and earn a living and get back his self-respect.

Mr. HAYDEN. I know that the Senator from Maryland is not serious in that remark, and no Senator is proposing anything of the kind.

To return to my text, the credit of the United States will not be impaired by the enactment of this legislation. We are so close to the depression, and it has affected many of us in such a serious way, that I fear we cannot see the forest for the trees and the underbrush. Perhaps an outside perspective would be helpful to us in an examination into the situation. We have a great neighbor to the north, Canada. Let me tell the Senate what some responsible Canadians think of the ability of our Government to liquidate the public debt without imposing serious handicaps upon present economic recovery and future economic stability.

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

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. BORAH. Does the Senator from Arizona think the credit of the United States would be impaired if we should pass the bonus bill?

Mr. HAYDEN. I am not in favor of the passage of the soldiers' bonus bill. I have twice voted against it. I do say that the credit of the United States would not be impaired or broken if we should pass the bonus bill.

Mr. BORAH. Or if we should pass the Townsend old-age pension bill?

Mr. HAYDEN. The Townsend old-age-pension bill goes into realms which I am sure the Senator himself will not care to discuss.

Mr. BORAH. No. I am trying to get an idea as to the limit of the credit of the United States. All these matters may be before us for consideration.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is exactly the subject upon which I propose to speak.

Mr. BORAH. Very well.

Mr. HAYDEN. I have here a statement issued by a great and solid bank in Canada. There was not a bank failure in the Dominion during this world-wide depression. In common with many of our larger financial institutions, one of them, the Royal Bank of Canada at Montreal, issues a monthly economic statement. This statement is approved by the officials of the bank and by its economic advisers. I desire to quote from it briefly. In discussing world conditions, the statement says:

> Within the United States excessive pessimism as to world conditions retards improvement, and doubt as to prospects in that country holds back business in other countries.
>
> While there are reasons for this mutual distrust it would seem that the barometer is rising both within and without the United States.

And then, with direct reference to our own country, I ask the Senate to listen with attention to this statement:

> In the United States the depression became more acute than in other countries. If capacity to survive unprecedented shocks constitutes a basis for confidence in the future, the future of the United States is assured. The Government has spent and is spending money freely, but alarm concerning such expenditures would seem to be somewhat exaggerated when it is considered—

And mark these words—

> that if the United States and individual States were to maintain the recent scale of expenditure for 20 years, the resultant debt load would bear no heavier proportion to normal predepression national income than does the present debt load in Great Britain. Further, if the Government, State, county, and municipal debts are combined, the total amounts to less than $50,000,000,000, as compared with a normal income that amounted to between $75,000,000,000 and $80,000,000,000 per year at the price level which prevailed under the old gold standard. With a depreciation of 40 percent, it seems probable that national income may easily exceed $100,000,000,000. The public debt of Great Britain is a sum equal to twice the national annual income, and when the debt of local government bodies is added it comes to a sum more than two and one-third times as large as the (British) national income.

It must not be inferred from this statement that the United Kingdom has not had difficulty in carrying its debt load—for it has.

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

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

Mr. COSTIGAN. Has the Senator before him an indication of the per capita debt in the United States and in the United Kingdom?

Mr. HAYDEN. I have.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Apparently, according to figures before me, in the year ending March 31, 1934, the per capita national debt, not including State and local indebtedness, for the United States was $209. For the United Kingdom, converted to dollars at par, the per capita national debt at that time was $807. Perhaps the Senator from Arizona will be good enough to elaborate on those figures and enlighten the Senate with respect to them.

Mr. HAYDEN. I have here a report made to the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation which takes into consideration not only the national but the State and local debts.

According to this report, the total per capita public debt of the United Kingdom, national and local, was $991 while

in the United States the per capita public debt was $370. This report was issued in January 1934.

Mr. BORAH. Has the Senator the figures as to the national debt of China?

Mr. HAYDEN. I do not have data as to the Chinese national debt, but I have some figures, which I will be glad to give to the Senate a little later, comparing our own national debt and that of other, perhaps, more economically advanced countries than China.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. I was called from the Chamber for a moment. Did the Senator take into consideration the debts of States, counties, cities, and other political subdivisions?

Mr. HAYDEN. I did all that.

Mr. BYRD. The figures total, as my information is, if this joint resolution shall be passed, approximately $55,000,000,000, which is substantially more than the national income at the present time.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator is not quite correct in his figures. The statement made in the Royal Bank of Canada circular was so startling to me and differs so widely from the doleful tales we have been hearing that I determined to find from authoritative sources whether it could be justified. I have done so, and I shall show before I conclude that the statement is quite accurate as to the financial responsibility and burden of the Federal Government and its ability to pay the national debt as the same now exists or may hereafter be increased.

Our gross national debt, to respond to the Senator from Virginia, according to the best available figures—and they are based on a Treasury statement as of January 31, 1934—was $28,479,000,000.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the Senator has got to add $6,000,000,000 to that, because the President says that on July 1, 1935, if this measure shall be passed, the debt will be $34,200,000,000.

Mr. HAYDEN. The President, I am sure, made that statement on the side of caution. It will be remembered that a year ago the President somewhat shocked the country by a statement of what the probable Treasury deficit would be. The actual facts, as they developed, did not justify the prediction he then made. I wish to make it perfectly clear to the Senator that I am talking about the national-debt figures as they existed on January 1, 1935. The Senator from Virginia can perhaps better than I look into the future and say what the public debt will be.

Mr. BYRD. I suggest to the Senator that the passage of the pending joint resolution alone will add $5,000,000,000 to the public debt.

Mr. HAYDEN. As to the gross State and local debt, the best figures which I have been able to obtain were prepared by the Industrial Conference Board, a very reliable institution. In a recent book entitled "The Cost of Government, 1923–34", at page 36, the total is given at $20,173,000,000. So that the combined public debt of the United States, the States, counties, and municipalities in 1934 may be set at $48,652,000,000.

The debt must be paid out of income, and so I have sought to obtain as accurate information as possible as to what has been the national income, from which we may estimate what the national income may be for the future.

The National Industrial Conference Board again prepared a set of figures, which have been checked and brought down to date by the Department of Commerce. I shall quote the totals for the following years:

In 1926 the income produced in the United States was estimated at $78,500,000,000; in 1927 at $77,200,000,000; in 1928 at $80,500,000,000; in 1929, which was the peak year, at $82,935,000,000; in 1930 at $70,588,000,000; in 1931 at $55,334,000,000; in 1932 at $40,755,000,000; and in 1933 at $42,665,000,000. The estimate for 1934 is not available, but from the best data now obtainable it is expected that the amount will not be far from $50,000,000,000.

NATIONAL INCOME PAID OUT

The Department of Commerce, pursuant to a resolution submitted by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], prepared a report on the national income from 1929 to 1932 and adopted a new and rather interesting method. Instead of counting only income produced, the Division of Economic Research of the Department also took into consideration income paid out. The results I have at hand as revised by the Department, and shall read them:

In 1929 the national income paid out was $82,300,000,000; in 1930 it was $75,800,000,000; in 1931 it was $63,300,000,000; in 1932 it was $49,700,000,000; in 1933 it was $46,000,000,000. The best estimate is that the national income paid out for 1934 will be $52,000,000,000.

Since 1929 the debt of State and local governments has increased at the rate of about one-half billion dollars a year, while the gross national debt up to date has increased at the rate of about two and one-half billion dollars a year. We must definitely tie up in any consideration of this problem the annual national income produced and its proportionate ratio in liquidating ability to the public debt. Income paid out means money actually passing into the hands of the income receivers, and is larger than income produced, because it includes interest, dividend, and salary payments out of accumulated surplus. Taxes are actually paid from income paid out, and hence it seems a more logical basis for comparison with the national debt and the service of the national debt.

RETURNS TO LABOR AND CAPITAL

Considerable surprise and concern has been recently expressed at certain figures released by Mr. Leon Henderson, of the National Recovery Administration, which show that at the end of 1934 pay rolls were 60 percent of the 1926 pay rolls and the purchasing power per worker was about the same as in 1926, whereas income from interest and investments was 150 percent of the 1926 income from that source, or half again as great.

The figures I have just read to the Senate in part explain what appears to be a startling discrepancy between the wages of labor and the earnings of capital.

It will be observed that in 1929 the national income paid out was $600,000,000 less than the income produced. In other words, in that year $600,000,000 was saved out of income and made available for reinvestment. In 1930 a radical change took place. The national income produced dropped to $70,000,000,000 and the income paid out amounted to $75,000,000,000. In 1931 the discrepancy rose to $8,000,000,000, because income dropped to $55,000,000,000 and $63,000,000,000 were paid out. The year 1932 was the worst of all. With national income at only $40,000,000,000, $49,000,000,000 were paid out, leaving a net loss of $9,000,000,000. In 1933 there was a change for the better. The national income was increased to $42,000,000,000 and the income paid out was reduced to $46,000,000,000, so that the unfavorable balance was cut more than in half. It is estimated that for 1934 the difference will be only $2,000,000,000.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President——

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

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator has referred to the national income. I presume what that embraces is value of the products of the farm, the factory, the mine, and the forest produced in that year plus returns on investments outside of products of the kind mentioned—what amount of the national income arises from the creation of new wealth, per se, and what amount of national income arises from wealth created, but not in this country, by investments.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is exactly the distinction I am trying to make to the Senate by stating these amounts, which show that from 1930 to 1934, inclusive, $28,000,000,000 have been withdrawn from reserves and other forms of accumulated capital in order to meet interest and dividend payments. Considering industry as a whole, there was no other source

from which such payments could have been obtained. The heaviest draft on such accumulations was in 1932.

THE WORST IS OVER

The worst of this strain is over and the trend of the figures indicates that this year, 1935, should see our national income produced in excess of $50,000,000,000 and again in excess of the national income paid out. In other words, there has been a substantial reduction in the draft by business upon accumulated surpluses and other assets in order to make current income payments.

For 5 years business generally has been in the "red", but when the American people, as a whole, shall have balanced their budget by producing more than they pay out, we may reasonably expect the Federal Government to balance its Budget, because there will be profits to be taxed, which did not exist during the half decade of depression.

BRITISH NATIONAL AND LOCAL DEBT

The comparative data as to the United Kingdom indicates that Great Britain is in a far less favorable position relative to its total debt and its income produced than is the United States. The London Economist for January 5 gives the figures for the British national debt as of December 31, 1934, at £8,144,000,000, which, converted into dollars with the pound at par, would be $39,579,840,000.

The local authorities of the United Kingdom have incurred indebtedness in the same manner as our States, counties, and municipalities. The following figures, taken from the Seventy-seventh Statistical Abstract of the United Kingdom, published in January 1934, show a total of such debts as being £1,375,293,469, which, converted into dollars, would be $6,682,500,000. The total British national debt, national and local combined, may, therefore, be fixed at $46,262,340,000, as compared to the $48,652,000,000 for the United States.

The table from which I have been reading is as follows:

United Kingdom—Local authorities—Outstanding loan debt (less sinking-fund assets)

England and Wales (Mar. 31, 1931):	
Total	£1,303,833,229
Less sinking-fund assets	88,454,940
	1,215,378,289
Scotland (Mar. 31, 1930):	
Total	142,871,158
Less sinking-fund assets	2,211,601
	140,659,557
Northern Ireland (Mar. 31, 1932):	
Total	19,255,623
Grand total	1,375,293,469 ($6,682,500,000)

(Source: Statistical Abstract of the United Kingdom—77th no. 1934 (Government publication).)

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Can the Senator give the Senate an estimate of the private debt owed by the corporations and people of Great Britain?

Mr. HAYDEN. I had not thought it advisable at this time to enter that field, either as to Great Britain or the United States. I am primarily concerned with the ability of the Government of the United States to meet its obligations.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. The New York Times of yesterday carried a two-column article by some allegedly famous economist of London. I have the clipping, but I cannot find it at the moment. If I read the article correctly, he made the statement that the national debt of Great Britain is much in excess of the national debt in this country per capita, but that the private debt in Great Britain is negligible in comparison with the private debt existing in the United States. While it is true that in this country we have only $30,000,000,000 of national debt, we have approximately $225,000,000,000 of private debt which the people must pay, just the same as they must pay the national debt.

A moment ago the Senator made a statement referring to China as a country not advanced. I wonder if the Senator means that China is a backward country?

Mr. HAYDEN. I made no such reference to China as a backward country. I spoke of other countries more comparable to our own.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Last year the House and Senate passed a silver bill which provided for the purchase of silver in the markets of the world. When we entered upon that program we created a demand for silver and silver began to increase in value. Within 30 or 60 days after our silver program began to operate, silver began to respond by going up from 45 to 50 cents an ounce.

Just as soon as silver began to advance in value the Chinese unit, which is the dollar, began to advance in value and that of course had an effect upon Chinese economy. As the dollar became more valuable, commodities and goods in China began to fall. In 30 or 60 days this backward country of China, knowing exactly what was happening to it, filed a protest with our American Government against our policy of bidding up their silver, raising the value of their Chinese dollar, deflating China.

In this country since 1920 we have seen the gold dollar continue to advance in value. That was 15 years ago. While backward China in 30 or 60 days knew exactly what was being done to them and who was doing it, our bright United States financiers, or some of them, have not yet found out what has been done to us after 15 years of the rising value of gold.

Mr. HAYDEN. I was in China last summer. There is no question at all that depreciation in the price of silver had exactly the same effect on Chinese trade that the depreciation of the British pound had upon British trade. The foreign commerce of both countries gained by the depreciation. The action our Government took to raise the price of silver of course deflated commodity prices in China. They were quick to understand that because there are no better business men in the world than the Chinese.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. GLASS. I do not as yet get the point of the Senator's comparison. Suppose we admit right away that Great Britain is in a worse fix than the United States, is that a logical reason why we should get in as bad a fix as Great Britain?

Mr. HAYDEN. Oh, by no means.

Mr. GLASS. If Great Britain is in such shape that she refuses to pay her indebtedness to the United States, is that a good reason why we should get the United States in such a fix as that we would be unable to pay our indebtedness to anybody?

Mr. HAYDEN. No one in the Senate, I am sure, would argue that our Government should assume any unnecessary burden of debt. The question that is before the Senate is the joint resolution appropriating $4,880,000,000, which Senators are seeking to reduce in amount because they fear the credit of the United States will be impaired.

Mr. GLASS. But the Senator is arguing a comparison between the situation of Great Britain and this Government in order to show that the credit of this country will not be impaired.

Mr. HAYDEN. Exactly so.

Mr. GLASS. I think if the credit of Great Britain has been so badly impaired that for the first time in the whole history of that country she has repudiated her indebtedness to other nations, that does not afford a sufficient reason why we should get into the same fix.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. HAYDEN. Certainly.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I should like to invite the attention of the Senator from Arizona to the fact that apparently the investors of Great Britain regard the credit of their Govern-

ment as being exceedingly sound, because within recent times that Government has been able to make one of the greatest refunding operations in all history, in which they reduced materially the interest rate on their outstanding Government obligations.

Mr. GLASS. That was all a voluntary affair and arose from the extreme patriotism of the British people.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I do not believe the people of this country are any less patriotic than those living in Great Britain.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I have indicated the national income of the United States and made comparison of the national debt of the United States with that of the United Kingdom. I have been unable to obtain any very recent figures on the national income produced in Great Britain and Northern Ireland. The best figures obtainable are that the sum is between £3,500,000,000 and £4,000,000,000, or between $17,000,000,000 and $20,000,000,000 in American money. Mr. Colin Clark, formerly on the staff of the economic advisory council to the English cabinet, estimates the gross British national income for the years 1929 to 1931, as follows:

1929	£4,434,000,000
1930	4,375,000,000
1931	3,938,000,000

In those years the United States had a national income of about $70,000,000,000. I have shown that the total income paid out in the United States was more than equal to the national debt in 1934.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President——

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

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Assuming that the appropriation of $4,880,000,000 does not impair the national credit, assuming that we shall make some progress with the appropriation in the way of recovery, does not the Senator from Arizona feel that somewhat the same situation will exist as a chronic condition after this money has been expended? If he agrees that such condition will exist, would the Senator then advocate another expenditure of $4,000,000,000 to do the same thing over again?

Mr. HAYDEN. It is true that there has come about a very profound change in economic conditions in our country. After the Civil War, for example, there was the great West open to settlement and homesteading. Anyone without work could go West and obtain a farm. But after the World War the entire country was settled up. We could not provide a home for anyone who sought it in the wilderness. We are coming in this country to be more like the older European countries. There will continue to be in this country a condition which has existed in Europe for centuries—a certain number of unemployed persons. It varies according to world economic conditions.

England has had very serious unemployment which has dropped to a comparatively normal figure. The English have devised a plan of unemployment insurance and methods of taking care of the unemployed. Treating such a situation as a permanent matter is vastly different than to follow the methods which Congress has pursued to merely get out of the depression. The figures I have given the Senate and the facts which I shall present show that we are well on the way out.

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

Mr. HAYDEN. Certainly.

Mr. TYDINGS. I think the Senator has put his finger on the very thing I have in mind. Assuming that there is going to be a chronic condition in reference to unemployment, I think the time has come when we must lay some taxes and formulate a long-range permanent humane program. My protest is that money is being thrown out through what are designated as emergency measures, and we have now had 2 years of this; and I am not inclined to go along and waste four or five billion dollars if we are going to come to the point where we shall have to deal with this matter in a realistic, long-range program.

I have asked my question of the Senator because I think we are at the point where a 2-year appropriation in the hope of " priming the pump ", and so forth, is not the right way to approach this question. As long as we remain a creditor and an exporting nation, it strikes me we shall have a permanent unemployment program; and we might as well realize it, and we might as well cut our cloth accordingly. If we insist on running the United States as a nationalistic country, notwithstanding we have twenty-six or twenty-eight billion dollars of Government indebtedness, and insist on selling to the world more than we buy from it, and at the same time we have a well of unemployment, which, in my judgment, will vary between six and fifteen million workable people every year, I cannot see the sense of a program which for 2 years only provides for a third of those people. My point is, Where will we be 2 years from now if we shall not have made an improvement? Are we going on with this sort of legislation over and over again every couple of years?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is the whole question—if we shall have made no improvement. I believe, and I think the country is well satisfied, that the United States has made substantial progress in getting out of the economic depression which began in 1929. We shall meet the situation 2 years from now as we find it, and I am sure it will not be as serious as it is today.

To get back to my theme, I have demonstrated that the national income paid out was more than equal to the National, State, and local debt of the United States in the year 1934. The British gross national income was not equal to half of the national debt in that year.

A farmer with an average net income of $1,000 ordinarily can borrow that amount without difficulty from his local bank. A man who has a steady and assured income of $10,000 each year would not be considered in a bad financial condition if he owed $10,000.

A business with regular earnings of $100,000 per annum would certainly be considered entirely solvent if its total debt was only $100,000. A corporation which shows average profits of a million a year could almost instantly borrow a million for working capital if that sum would represent its total indebtedness.

We stand today, then, with a national debt that is less than 1 year's national income, and it follows inevitably that the credit of the United States is good.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. KING. Does the Senator, in making his admirable argument, take into account as one of the factors to be considered in all our national appropriations the additional fact that the indebtedness of the people of the United States—National, State, political subdivisions, corporations, and individuals—according to the very best authorities, is $275,000,000,000? Does the Senator take into account the fact that the States and counties and the political subdivisions of the States owe approximately $17,000,000,000?

Mr. HAYDEN. Apparently the Senator from Utah did not listen very attentively to my remarks, because I said that the sum of the debts of the States, counties, and municipalities amounted at present to over $20,000,000,000.

Mr. KING. I came into the Chamber after the Senator had made that statement; but, I repeat, is the Senator taking all those factors into account when he is making an appeal for this enormous appropriation?

Mr. HAYDEN. I am, indeed, because in my judgment the entire appropriation is necessary to accomplish the purpose we seek. I am addressing myself to the primary question which has been raised here as to the effect of this appropriation upon the credit of the United States.

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

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I shall not interrupt the Senator again.

Assuming that what the Senator says is true, that he has made out a good case, that this particular appropriation does

not jeopardize the credit of the country, I think the Senator will be fair enough to concede, however, that every billion dollars of debt which we add to the total makes eventual recovery that much more difficult. In other words, the lower we keep the national debt, the lower will be the taxation we shall have to put on the people as they begin to emerge from the depression; and the higher we make the national debt, the more severely we must penalize any progress which we make out of the depression.

Mr. HAYDEN. If the Senator is correct, Congress should not have made any of the relief appropriations that were made heretofore. On the Senator's theory, that was an error, that was a mistake, because it put our country into debt; yet I firmly believe that Congress has made no better investment than we did in the $3,300,000,000 relief bill which was passed during the last Congress.

DISTORTED STATISTICS

It is very easy to pile up figures. There is a gentleman in another body at the other end of the Capitol, for whom I have very high regard—except when he distorts statistics for partisan and political purposes—who took the recent statement of the public debt of the United States and added thereto not only the normal issues of Government bonds, but included as an obligation of the United States the Federal farm-loan bonds amounting to $814,000,000, the Home Owners' Loan Corporation bonds amounting to $1,564,000,000, and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation bonds of $250,000,000—a total of bond issues based upon guaranties made by the United States of $2,600,000,000—and insisted that the entire sum should be counted in as a part of the national debt. That total of $2,600,000,000 will undoubtedly be increased, because there were not of record at that time the bonds of the Federal Housing Corporation, which bear a full Federal guaranty. Everyone knows, however, that behind these bonds there is ample security and that the liability of the United States is only contingent and remote; yet, to spread an alarm, my able friend could not resist the temptation to call this $2,600,000,000 a part of the national debt.

On this very same Treasury statement it is shown that the credit of the United States is pledged to pay the principal and interest of postal-savings deposits amounting to $1,216,252,248.70 and is obligated to redeem at their face value Federal Reserve notes amounting to $3,421,656,824. These two sums, amounting to over $4,637,000,000, could equally well be counted into the national debt by my friend in the other body, yet no fair-minded man would do so, because he knows that no real or substantial liability exists.

Such untrammeled use of pencil and paper to make figures to scare the public is just as unjustifiable as it would be to include on the other side of the ledger the $12,015,000,000 which foreign governments owe to our country. Everyone knows that, save for $8,400,000 which will be paid by Finland, all of the foreign debts must at this time be left out of the calculation of income to the Federal Treasury.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. KING. Is the Senator sure that the obligations due the United States for loans upon homes will be paid? I am told by many, who are familiar with the loans which have been made and the foreclosures which are about to be instituted, that we shall lose from 10 to 25 percent of all that will be loaned to home owners.

Mr. HAYDEN. I am sure there are no authentic data to justify such a pessimistic conclusion. Our experience first began with the Federal Farm Loan System. Congress established that System during the Wilson administration, advanced funds to set it going, and the Federal Government was completely reimbursed within a comparatively few years. Whether the farm loans and the home loans are collected depends solely upon whether or not the American people are doing business at a profit. If the farmer can make a profit on the crops he produces, he will pay his farm loan. If conditions in the United States are prosperous and men have employment, they will pay their home loans. There was no justification for the expansion of the old farm-loan system, nor for the inauguration of the new home-loan system, except that we expect to get out of this depression; we expect again to operate on a basis where the American people generally will be making money with which to pay their debts.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. MINTON. As bearing upon that subject, it might be interesting to the Senator to know that the latter part of last week one of the executive officers of the Federal Land Bank of Louisville, Ky., told me that that institution is collecting more money now than the loans that mature. That is to say, it is collecting all that mature, and is collecting on past-due paper.

Mr. HAYDEN. I have no doubt but that is true, and I think it is particularly due to the very fine price that is being received for tobacco in Kentucky.

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

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. STEIWER. Does the Senator from Arizona contend that in calculating the public debt of this country no regard at all should be taken of the so-called "contingent liabilities"? Does he exclude them entirely from his calculations?

Mr. HAYDEN. I do, and I think very properly so, because the moneys advanced from the Treasury in that regard are in one sense an asset rather than a liability. If times are satisfactory in the United States, if the American people are prosperous, the loans thus made will be repaid, and their repayment will tend to reduce taxes in future years. They constitute an asset that the British Government does not possess.

Mr. STEIWER. I heard the Senator's earlier statement that the entire aggregate of these contingent liabilities ought not to be included. With that I agree, because against those liabilities there are assets, and obviously it is not a sound calculation to include the whole liability when it is not all going to result in loss; but let us take, for illustration, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation debentures. Does the Senator feel that he is justified in regarding those transactions as not being productive of loss when we know that losses have already occurred? Take the Chicago situation, for instance. I have heard officials of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation admit that losses will result from the loans made in that area. They did not name the amount. I think they do not yet know the amount; but there is an admitted loss in some of those transactions.

Would it not be sound procedure, in making the calculation, to say that the loss with respect to the contingent liabilities of the Government is such an amount as may prove to be translated into loss after the facts are all known and understood?

Mr. HAYDEN. The precedessor of and the model for the Reconstruction Finance Corporation was the War Finance Corporation created on April 5, 1918, during the World War. That Corporation loaned $690,431,000 of Federal funds, and principally under the able management of Eugene Meyer, $688,475,000 has been repaid. The last annual report of the War Finance Corporation shows that its entire operations have resulted in a net profit to the Treasury of $64,631,000. The collection of interest offset all losses and made a net gain of that amount. The interest collected on the loans that were paid wiped out losses amounting to $2,000,000, just as happens in any large bank.

Mr. STEIWER. That is true; but those operations were carried out on an appreciating market. Does the Senator feel that it is fair to take that as an illustration when we know, with respect to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, that it has already sustained admitted losses?

Mr. HAYDEN. And yet the report submitted by Jesse Jones shows that up to December 31, 1934, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation has made earnings above interest

and expenses which amount to $65,175,963, which sum may be an offset against the very losses the Senator mentions.

Mr. STEIWER. As far as it will go.

Mr. HAYDEN. As far as it will go, at least.

Mr. STEIWER. I agree with that.

Mr. HAYDEN. I have been furnished by the legislative reference service of the Library of Congress with a comparative tabulation of the British and American debts since the World War which I shall put into the RECORD.

National debt figures for Great Britain and the United States by years 1919 to 1934

Year	Great Britain			United States dollars [4]
	British pounds [1]	Conversion value of pound [2]	American dollars [3]	
	1,000's		*1,000's*	*1,000's*
1919	7,481,050	$4.43	33,141,052	25,482,034
1920	7,875,642	3.67	28,903,606	24,297,918
1921	7,623,097	3.85	29,348,923	23,976,251
1922	7,720,532	4.43	34,201,957	22,964,079
1923	7,812,563	4.57	35,703,413	22,349,688
1924	7,707,538	4.42	34,067,318	21,251,120
1925	7,665,880	4.83	36,966,200	20,516,272
1926	7,633,973	4.86	37,099,894	19,643,183
1927	7,652,688	4.86	37,192,064	18,510,174
1928	7,630,973	4.87	37,162,839	17,604,291
1929	7,620,854	4.86	37,037,350	16,931,198
1930	7,596,211	4.86	36,917,585	16,185,308
1931	7,582,900	4.53	34,350,537	16,801,485
1932	7,647,950	3.51	26,844,305	19,487,010
1933	7,859,726	4.24	33,325,238	22,538,672
1934	7,822,060			27,053,086

[1] Statistical Abstract for the United Kingdom, 1912 to 1926, p. 118; 1919 to 1932, p. 146.
[2] Federal Reserve Bulletin, January 1928, p. 56; January 1932, p. 54; February 1935, p. 104.
[3] Computed.
[4] Annual Report of the Secretary of the U. S. Treasury for 1934, p. 350.

I was also furnished with a second tabulation relating to revenue and expenditures of both Governments, which shows that the British budget has been out of balance for 5 years out of the past 9. Yet, as was pointed out by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], that did not prevent a magnificent refunding operation, converting the national debt at a lower rate of interest. The American Budget was balanced for 10 years, from 1920 to 1930. It has been out of balance for only the past 4 years.

The total revenue of the British Government of the past 5 years was $18,420,000,000. The total expenditures amounted to $18,558,000,000, leaving a deficit for that period of $137,000,000.

The total revenue paid into the American Treasury during the same 5 years was $15,132,000,000. The expenditures of the United States were $23,810,000,000, leaving a net deficit for the half decade of $8,678,000,000.

Within the 5-year period I have included the year 1930, when we did not operate at a deficit. Omitting that year, the net increase in the public debt during the past 4 fiscal years was $10,867,000. From June 30, 1934, to January 1 of this year, the American national debt was increased by $1,426,000,000, or at the rate of about $3,000,000,000 for this fiscal year.

Mr. President, I ask that the tables to which I have referred may be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

Total revenue and expenditures for Great Britain and the United States by years, 1919 to 1934

Fiscal year [1]	Great Britain					United States	
	Revenue [2]	Expenditure [2]	Conversion value of pound [3]	Revenue [4]	Expenditure [4]	Revenue [5]	Expenditure [5]
	1,000 £	*1,000 £*		*1,000 U. S. dollars*	*1,000 U. S. dollars*	*1,000 dollars*	*1,000 dollars*
1919	889,021	2,579,301	$4.43	3,938,363	11,426,303	5,152,257	18,514,880
1920	1,339,571	1,665,773	3.67	4,916,226	6,113,387	6,694,565	6,403,344
1921	1,425,985	1,195,428	3.85	5,490,042	4,602,398	5,624,933	5,115,928
1922	1,124,880	1,079,187	4.43	4,983,218	4,780,798	4,109,104	3,372,603
1923	914,012	812,497	4.57	4,177,035	3,713,111	4,007,135	3,294,628
1924	837,169	788,840	4.42	3,700,287	3,486,673	4,012,045	3,048,678
1925	799,436	795,777	4.83	3,861,276	3,843,603	3,780,149	3,063,105
1926	812,062	826,100	4.86	3,946,621	4,014,846	3,962,756	3,097,612
1927	805,701	842,395	4.86	3,915,707	4,094,040	4,129,394	2,974,030
1928	842,824	838,585	4.87	4,104,553	4,083,909	4,042,348	3,103,265
1929	836,435	818,041	4.86	4,065,074	3,975,679	4,033,250	3,298,859
1930	814,970	829,494	4.86	3,960,754	4,031,341	4,177,942	3,440,269
1931	857,761	881,037	4.53	3,885,657	3,991,098	3,317,233	3,779,868
1932	851,482	851,118	3.51	2,988,702	2,987,424	2,121,228	4,861,696
1933	827,031	859,310	4.24	3,506,611	3,643,474	2,238,356	4,845,018
1934	809,379	774,927	5.04	4,079,270	3,905,632	3,277,734	6,883,862

[1] Fiscal year ends Mar. 31 in Great Britain, and June 30, in the United States.
[2] Statistical abstract of the United Kingdom 1912 to 1926, p. 107; 1919 to 1932, p. 135; London economist, Budget supplement, Apr. 14, 1934, p. 2.
[3] Federal Reserve Bulletin, January 1928, p. 56; January 1932, p. 54; February 1935, p. 104.
[4] Computed.
[5] Annual report of the Secretary of the United States Treasury for 1934, p. 301.
[6] Ibid., p. 305.

Mr. HAYDEN. On the face of these figures the British have kept their budget much nearer in balance than has our Government. But Great Britain had sound banks that did not require a penny of Government aid to keep them solvent. The American people do business principally with bank checks, and when hundreds of banks failed or were temporarily closed, there was a contraction in our most customary form of circulating medium which amounted to billions of dollars. Furthermore, the British Government was wise enough to go off the gold standard almost 2 years before we did, to the great advantage of both the English foreign commerce and internal trade.

Our Government was compelled to use its credit and borrow money for the purpose of financing banks, insurance companies, and other financial institutions, which otherwise would have utterly collapsed. The British Government was under no such necessity and consequently could keep its budget nearer in balance.

The daily Treasury statement for February 1 contains a combined statement of assets and liabilities of governmental corporations and credit agencies as of January 1, 1935. The total assets of these corporations and agencies is over $10,000,000,000. The total liabilities amount to over six billions. The difference between these assets and liabilities is largely represented by money loaned to these organizations from the United States Treasury, and amounts to $4,474,240,000.

This $4,474,240,000 accounts for just that much of the American budgetary deficit which came from causes which did not exist in Great Britain, and which the British treasury did not have to meet. The $4,474,240,000 has been loaned by our Government on adequate security, and will be repaid in future years to the great relief of American taxpayers. I shall include the statement in an abridged form in the RECORD, which is as follows:

Summary of combined statement of assets and liabilities of governmental corporations and credit agencies of the United States, compiled from latest reports received by the Treasury, Jan. 31, 1935

	Total assets	Liabilities and reserves			Excess of assets over liabilities	Proprietary interest	
		Guaranteed by United States	Not guaranteed by United States	Total		Privately owned	Owned by United States
I. Financed wholly from Government funds:							
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	$2,588,887,714	$250,679,592	$16,989,017	$267,668,609	$2,321,219,105		$2,321,219,105
Commodity Credit Corporation	40,563,292		61,157	61,157	40,502,135		40,502,135
Export-Import Banks	14,207,144		404,634	404,634	13,802,510		13,802,510
Public Works Administration	269,071,605				269,071,605		269,071,605
Regional agricultural credit corporations	90,888,070		612,892	612,892	90,275,178		90,275,178
Production credit corporations	114,507,037		1,601,122	1,601,122	112,905,915		112,905,915
Panama Railroad Co	43,220,103		722,519	722,519	42,497,584		42,497,584
U. S. Shipping Board Merchant Fleet Corporation	210,458,712		16,553,631	16,553,631	193,905,081		193,905,081

Summary of combined statement of assets and liabilities of governmental corporations and credit agencies of the United States, compiled from latest reports received by the Treasury, Jan. 31, 1935

	Total assets	Liabilities and reserves			Excess of assets over liabilities	Proprietary interest	
		Guaranteed by United States	Not guaranteed by United States	Total		Privately owned	Owned by United States
I. Financed wholly from Government funds—Continued.							
War emergency corporations and agencies	$14,991,598		$75,000	$75,000	$14,916,598		$14,916,598
Other	356,452,304		101,052,113	101,052,113	255,400,191		255,400,191
Total group I	3,743,247,579	$250,679,592	138,072,085	388,751,677	3,354,495,902		3,354,495,902
II. Financed partly from Government funds and partly from private funds:							
Federal land banks	2,246,582,272		1,884,936,890	1,884,936,890	361,645,382	$107,697,019	253,948,363
Federal intermediate credit banks	244,014,024		175,497,859	175,497,859	68,516,165		68,516,165
Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation	1,278,313,605	1,048,464,633	27,542,947	1,076,007,580	202,306,025		202,306,025
Banks for cooperatives	119,371,702		4,968	4,968	119,366,734	1,614,267	117,752,467
Home-loan banks	110,096,172		4,253,432	4,253,432	105,842,740	23,777,372	82,065,368
Home Owners' Loan Corporation	2,638,587,144	2,205,917,005	344,647,805	2,550,564,810	88,022,334		88,022,334
Federal Savings & Loan Insurance Corporation	102,172,695		324,244	324,244	101,848,451		101,848,451
Federal Savings & Loan Associations	13,663,900				13,663,900		13,663,900
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	334,761,002		4,058,467	4,058,467	330,702,535	139,299,557	191,402,978
War Finance Corporation	232,863		10,578	10,578	222,285		222,285
Total, group II	7,087,795,379	3,254,381,638	2,441,277,190	5,695,658,828	1,392,136,551	272,388,215	1,119,748,336
Grand total	10,831,042,958	3,505,061,230	2,579,349,275	6,084,410,505	4,746,632,453	272,388,215	4,474,244,238

Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. STEIWER] has referred to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. I have here its annual statement made in January of this year. Page 8 of that statement shows that the total of loans, investments, and allocations actually disbursed by the Corporation since its inception on February 2, 1932, have been $6,843,073,223, of which $4,858,861,779.66 represents disbursements in its ordinary activities for loans, purchases of preferred stock, capital notes, and debentures of banks, and the purchase of securities from the Federal Emergency Administration of Public Works.

The remainder, $1,989,211,443.64, which is described in detail on page 15 of the report, was disbursed for allocation to other governmental agencies and for relief by direction of Congress and Executive order of the President.

The $4,858,000,000 has been over half repaid and represents the disbursements in ordinary activities of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. Of that sum there had been repaid, up to December 31, 1934, the sum of $2,465,000,000, or 51 percent of the total, leaving outstanding $2,393,000,000 as of that date, which should be collected in due course of business.

I feel quite confident that interest earned on that vast sum of over $2,000,000,000, which is now loaned on adequate security, will more than compensate for such losses as the Corporation may suffer, just as was the case with the War Finance Corporation.

LOANS TO MUNICIPALITIES

Mr. President, speaking of Government assets which, when collected, will be of benefit to future taxpayers, one of the large items is for loans financed wholly with Government funds through the Public Works Administration. I have here a letter from Secretary Ickes showing that $839,000,000 has been loaned in that regard upon which repayments may be expected. Seven hundred and thirty-four million dollars of that amount was loaned to municipalities, and their bonds have been taken as security. Fifty-three million dollars worth of these municipal bonds have been sold at a net profit to the Treasury of $902,000. The loans are good, and they will be of benefit to future taxpayers. The letter that I have received from the Administrator of Public Works is as follows:

FEDERAL EMERGENCY ADMINISTRATOR OF PUBLIC WORKS,
Washington, March 14, 1935.

Hon. CARL HAYDEN,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR HAYDEN: Complying with your request for information regarding certain phases of the P. W. A. program, the following is submitted:

Of the funds made available for this administration by the National Industrial Recovery Act of 1933 and the Emergency Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1935, the sum of approximately $839,000,000 from the allotments which have been made is repayable on account of public and private loans. This amount is composed of $105,000,000, representing loans made for reclamation projects through the Bureau of Reclamation and private loans and loans to public bodies amounting to $734,000,000.

Bonds purchased on account of these approved loans have a par value of $340,317,606. Sales which have been effected include bonds having a par value of $53,616,032. Proceeds derived from these security sales have given to this administration a net profit of $902,539 over and above their par value.

Other funds available for public works have been allotted, in part, to the States, cities, counties, and other political subdivisions as grants on non-Federal projects. Large sums have been expended for highway improvements, naval vessels, river-and-harbor work, flood control, seacoast defenses, and other types of projects comparable with the normal program of public construction as referred to in the act. Projects approved under the various classes of work have been studied thoroughly and determined to be economically sound and socially desirable. In the selection of projects for approval consideration has also been given to insure proper geographical distribution, as well as the maximum needed and useful employment.

Among these projects highway work stands out because of the speed with which the highway program has been placed under construction, its great employment-producing capacity, and its wide-spread distribution to every part of the Nation. Both this work and the river and harbor improvements are producing needed and immediately useful facilities which will result in savings in transportation costs.

The public-works program in its entirety contributes directly toward the conservation and development of our national resources and the protection of the life and property of our citizens.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD L. ICKES, *Administrator.*

AGRICULTURAL LOANS

There has been a vast amount of relief extended to those in distress by governmental agencies financed partly from Government funds and partly from private funds. Chief among these are the banks and corporations under the Farm Credit Administration. I have here a table which shows that $923,168,396 has been advanced during the past 5 years by the Federal Government for the relief of American agriculture. That is nearly a billion dollars which helped to swell our Budget deficit, but which, with a fair price in the future for farm crops, is loaned on good security. The British Treasury was faced with no such problem.

The table is as follows:

Capital and paid-in surplus owned by the Government in institutions and funds under the Farm Credit Administration Dec. 31, 1928, to Dec. 31, 1934

Institution or fund	Capital and surplus owned by the Government		
	Dec. 31, 1928	Dec. 31, 1934	Increase
Federal land banks	$439,225	$176,885,943	$176,446,718
Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation		200,000,000	200,000,000
Federal intermediate credit banks	27,000,000	100,000,000	73,000,000

Capital and paid-in surplus owned by the Government in institutions and funds under the Farm Credit Administration Dec. 31, 1928, to Dec. 31, 1934—Continued

Institution or fund	Capital and surplus owned by the Government		
	Dec. 31, 1928	Dec. 31, 1934	Increase
Production credit corporations		$112,000,000	$112,000,000
Banks for cooperatives		110,000,000	110,000,000
Regional agricultural credit corporations		54,246,602	54,246,602
Miscellaneous funds [1]	$1,193,908	198,668,986	197,475,078
Total	28,633,133	951,801,531	923,168,398

[1] Includes emergency crop and feed loan funds, fund for emergency loans in drought areas, fund for loans by Land Bank Commissioner to joint-stock land banks, and other funds. The distribution of capital and paid-in surplus owned by the Government was not readily available for each of these individual funds.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BULKLEY

I note sitting near me the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BULKLEY]. He delivered a very interesting address not long ago in Philadelphia, and I wish to read one paragraph from his remarks, which is directly in point and which will bring to a conclusion what I have to say with respect to loans made by our Government. The Senator said:

> Now, in round figures the Government, through agencies which it has wholly or partially financed, has provided for the making of various kinds of loans to the amount of about seven and a half billion dollars. In the assets of these governmental lending agencies the United States has a proprietary interest, with an actual investment value of nearly four and a half billion dollars. This amount, subject to such losses as may be incurred in the final liquidation of these accounts, plus two billion in gold which has been transferred to the stabilization fund, or a total of some $6,500,000,000 of assets, subject, of course, to possible losses, is held by the Government as a partial offset against the $10,700,000,000 increase in net debt during the past 4 years.

The British Government has never embarked upon any program of public works comparable to our own, although I understand that Mr. Lloyd George is now advocating that our example be followed and that such a policy be adopted in Great Britain. Congress has provided vast sums for public improvements of various kinds, and it has been necessary to borrow the money in order to do the work. However, there are fine results to show for these expenditures.

HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION

I hold in my hand a statement from the Bureau of Public Roads, showing that in the past 6 years there was expended $1,232,000,000 on highway construction. We have built 99,000 miles of new roads in the United States. Great Britain did not need 99,000 miles of new highways. The United States did, and we have them, and they are here as a permanent benefit to the generation to come, who will pay for the cost of such highways.

The tabulation is as follows:

Statement of expenditures and mileage of construction brought to completion under supervision of Bureau of Public Roads by fiscal years

Fiscal year	Federal funds, total expenditures	Mileage of construction brought to completion during the fiscal year
1929	$95,014,356	9,349.6
1930	88,755,453	9,449.1
1931	174,109,914	10,614.9
1932	213,089,647	16,472.7
1933	180,770,349	14,228.3
1934	246,170,178	21,725.1
July 1, 1934, to Feb. 28, 1935	234,704,754	17,592.3
Total	1,232,614,651	99,432.0

PUBLIC BUILDINGS

The Director of Procurement advises me that in the past 6 years there has been expended on public buildings the sum of $408,000,000. We have the buildings; they were needed; the money was not lost; the buildings are an asset to the United States. The details are as follows:

Amount expended for sites and construction of public buildings by the Treasury Department during the fiscal years 1929 to 1934, inclusive

Fiscal year:	*Expenditures*
1929	$30,525,422.79
1930	42,500,259.94
1931	67,512,633.25
1932	86,288,567.94
1933	105,598,954.63
1934	75,843,351.19
Total	408,269,189.00

RIVERS AND HARBORS

The Chief of Engineers of the Army shows that during the past 6 years we have spent on new construction and in the maintenance of river-and-harbor work the sum of $684,000,000. Commerce and navigation have been aided by those expenditures. The British ports probably needed no such improvement. We have gained an advantage by this definite work which has been done in our country for the benefit of commerce, and we have done it during this period of depression. The works constructed will be there and will be useful to those who have to repay the money borrowed on the credit of the United States to do the work. The break-down of such expenditures by fiscal years is as follows:

Expenditures during fiscal years 1929 to 1934

	1929	1930	1931	1932	1933	1934
Rivers and harbors, new work	$32,063,545	$45,639,073	$48,780,559	$52,042,650	$48,564,343	$78,554,709
Rivers and harbors, maintenance and operation	25,250,073	28,349,481	32,136,374	32,237,426	28,218,969	26,316,944
Flood control	25,300,563	26,455,408	37,891,751	29,228,727	39,576,531	48,143,462
Total	82,614,181	100,443,962	118,808,684	113,508,803	116,359,843	153,015,115
Total for 5 years						684,750,588

WORK-RELIEF PROJECTS

From the Federal Emergency Relief Administration, which has been constantly mentioned in the course of the debate on the pending joint resolution, I have a statement showing that up to date on all work projects there has been spent $1,977,000,000, either through the Civil Works Administration or the Emergency Relief Administration. If the work done was poorly done, if it was done in such an inefficient manner that the administration could not properly ask a credit for the full amount, at least it would be worth a half or a third of what it cost. Out of the total sum expended it is reasonable to claim beneficial results which are worth four or five hundred million dollars. I have made inquiry particularly with reference to roads, and I am told that over 500,000 miles of secondary roads in the United States have been improved by men on work relief.

The C. C. C. camps are another illustration.

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

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. HASTINGS. In the items which the Senator was giving about the expenditure for the past 6 years for public roads, for public buildings, and for rivers and harbors, the whole amount is not half as much as is included in this joint resolution; is it?

Mr. HAYDEN. No, Mr. President; I was referring to the normal activities of the Government. The conclusion implied in the Senator's question is correct.

Mr. HASTINGS. And for 6 years, the whole of those three activities, they have not spent half as much as is proposed to be appropriated under this joint resolution.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is true; but in the beginning of the 6-year period the American people were not in distress, and

in the middle period we had not learned how to properly carry on such work.

Mr. HASTINGS. I was under the impression, from the Senator's statements, that he tried to give the impression we were not in distress now.

Mr. HAYDEN. I desire to convey no such thought to the Senate. What I am trying to point out is that in the United States we had to meet a very different situation than existed in Great Britain, and that those who insist that we balance our Budget, as Great Britain has successfully balanced hers, do not take into consideration the burdens which our Government had to assume, under conditions with which the British Government was not faced at all.

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

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HATCH. Before the Senator leaves the point he is discussing, will he state whether he has taken into consideration benefits which may arise in the carrying out of the proposed program from, we will say, flood-control, soil-erosion work, and work of that sort, some of which has been slightly mentioned in debate in the last few days?

Mr. HAYDEN. In that respect I was just going to give to the Senate the latest figures obtainable on the expenditures in connection with the C. C. C. camps, which are particularly engaged in the kind of activities the Senator has described.

Mr. HATCH. I want the Senator to go into that, because the term "waste" has been frequently used here today. It has been said that this money has been "wasted." I hope the Senator will go further into that subject.

THE CIVILIAN CONSERVATION CORPS

Mr. HAYDEN. The total obligations for emergency conservation work up to December 31, 1934, have been $586,537,668, and the value of the work completed up to that date, as reported by the Departments of Agriculture, Interior, and War—it is under those Departments that the work was principally done—was estimated at $340,000,000. In other words, the work on soil erosion, on forestry, on flood control, and other constructive projects, has a permanent value of $340,000,000. In addition to that, the funds have been used to purchase forest lands and national park lands at cost, during this same period, of $24,000,000. The United States has the land to show for the $24,000,000, and that land has been improved by the C. C. C. men. During the same period the C. C. C. enrollees allotted to needy dependents $140,000,000. No one normally can become an enrollee in a C. C. C. camp unless he comes from a family on relief, and he receives $30 a month as his pay. He must allot $25 of that to his mother or his brothers and sisters—to his family. To that extent the relief roll where his family resides is relieved. So the actual pay of the enrollee in a C. C. C. camp is only $5 a month.

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

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. The Senator has discussed this subject from the standpoint of finances only. I was thinking, as he spoke, about the C. C. C. camps in his and my State, many of which I visited during the past year and observed the young men in those camps, many of them taken from the cities, out of lives of idleness, and put out there in our country, in the open air, in useful work. Even if none of the money spent in that way resulted in improvements having any actual physical value, would the Senator say that the C. C. C. work has been "wasted"?

Mr. HAYDEN. It is universally agreed that the greatest value which accrues from the Civilian Conservation Corps camps has been in the improvement of the morale of the men. The result of the expenditures has been to make them feel that they have a country which has an interest in them; to make them love it and want to defend it; to make them better citizens. That has been the biggest asset which has been created.

We were told in the course of this debate that it is all wrong to lay stress upon morale; that the cheapest way to relieve the needy is the best way; and the cheapest way, of course, is to give a family a grocery order and let them be fed; to buy them some clothing and pay their rent. Their distress can be relieved for less money in that way. The effect upon the population, however, is an entirely different question. I think such a policy would build up a generation of paupers.

Mr. HATCH. The Senator thinks, then, that the Congress has a right to take into consideration the increased morale value that comes from these things?

Mr. HAYDEN. There is no doubt about that; but I am pointing out that incidental to these expenditures there are physical improvements which have a permanent value to our country.

GOVERNMENT BONDS HELD BY BANKS

On more than one occasion it has been asserted that American banks hold more than one-half the outstanding United States bonds. I have sought to obtain the facts in that regard, and the figures I shall now quote were obtained in answer to questions I addressed to the Federal Reserve Board.

According to the Treasury statement, the total interest-bearing debt of the United States at the end of 1934 was $27,944,000,000. The total non-interest-bearing debt was $535,000,000. The gross debt was $28,479,000,000.

The Federal Reserve banks held $2,430,000,000 of Government securities at the end of 1934, or 8.7 percent of the interest-bearing debt. The member banks held $9,895,000,000 at that date, or 35.4 percent. This excludes guaranteed bonds, which are also excluded from the interest-bearing debt.

The holdings of Government securities by nonmember banks at the end of 1934 are not available. On June 30 they held $1,880,000,000, which was 6.7 percent of the interest-bearing debt at the end of the year.

Combining these percentages, the total of the interest-bearing debt of the United States held by all banks was 50.8 percent.

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on Appropriations has with propriety included in his calculations certain Farm Loan and Home Loan bonds and other securities issued by Government corporations. From a banker's point of view that is entirely correct, because such bonds, the principal and interest of which are guaranteed by the Government, have all the attributes of a Government bond so far as their market value and subsequent availability for prompt conversion into cash are concerned; but, as I have already shown, the taxpayer must view them in an entirely different light. His liability is merely contingent; and if these corporations function well enough to repay the sums advanced to them from the Federal Treasury, the future tax burden may be actually reduced.

BONDS HELD BY BRITISH BANKS

The total British public debt at the end of 1934 was £8,144,000,000, including the war debt. It was about £7,111,000,000, excluding the war debt. According to the London Economist of January 5, of which I have a copy here, the Bank of England held £344,927,394 of the British public debt at the end of the year, or 4.9 percent of the total debt, excluding the war-debt period. That figure compares with 8.7 percent held by our Federal Reserve banks.

The London joint-stock banks held between £700,000,000 and £740,000,000 at the end of the year, or between 9.8 and 10.4 percent of the total debt, less war debt. That compares with 35 percent of our public debt held by member banks in the Federal Reserve System.

The total loans and investments of the Federal Reserve banks at the end of the year were $2,458,000,000. The total for the member banks was $28,094,000,000. The two taken together aggregated $30,552,000,000. The total loans and investments of all banks in the United States as of June 30 was $42,763,000,000, excluding the Federal Reserve banks. Including the Federal Reserve banks, the figure was $45,225,000,000.

According to the London Economist, the total loans and investments of the London joint-stock banks at the end of December were £1,776,000,000. It is known that these banks

held over 90 percent of the banking assets in England. If the loans and investments of the Bank of England are added, the total is £2,158,000,000, or, in our money, $10,377,000,000, as compared to the total of $45,225,000,000 for American banks.

COMPARISON BY PERCENTAGES

These figures show that the loans and investments of American banks are four and one-half times the loans and investments of the British banks. Now, let me translate these figures into percentages for the purpose of comparison.

At the end of 1934, 50.8 percent of the United States Government debt was held by Federal Reserve banks, member banks of the Federal Reserve System, and nonmember banks. This compares with 15 percent of the British Government debt held by the Bank of England and the 10 London clearing banks. This does not mean, however, that American banks have invested a much larger proportion of their funds in Government securities than have the English banks. The contrary is true.

While member banks in this country hold 39 percent of their loans and investments in the form of Government securities, the London banks have at least 41 percent of their loans and investments so invested. Practically all the earning assets of both the Federal Reserve banks and the Bank of England at the present time consist of Government securities.

That a smaller proportion of the banking resources held in the form of United States securities constitutes a larger proportion of the public debt reflects the fact that this country's banking resources are much greater in relation to our public debt than is the case in England.

The total loans and investments of the Federal Reserve System exceed the national debt by about 10 percent and the loans and investments of all banks exceed our national debt by over 60 percent. On the other hand, the loans and investments of the London banks and the Bank of England are only about 25 percent of the English national debt.

The reasons which have led bankers to invest a large proportion of the resources at their disposal in Government securities are substantially the same in both countries. The demand of business men for loans in recent years has been small; the risks connected with the purchase of other types of securities have been high; and banks could not afford to allow all their funds to lie idle, since it was necessary for them to earn at least enough to pay operating expenses and interest on some of their deposits. From the banker's point of view, Government securities resemble cash in that they can be turned into cash on short notice, and they have the advantage over cash of yielding a small but certain return.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, the Senator should know that that is not true. He is obliged to know that if the banks of this country were to undertake to turn their Government securities into cash it would not only destroy the Government bond market but would destroy the bond market of every State, every municipality, and of every private enterprise.

Mr. HAYDEN. Yet the banks in England——

Mr. GLASS. Does not the Senator know that to be so?

Mr. HAYDEN. Of course, what the Senator from Virginia says is true, and it is equally true in Great Britain.

Mr. GLASS. Oh, no; in Great Britain, as I have shown—I have not the official figures before me at this time, but I had them before me when I made the statement—in Great Britain the banks hold 11 percent of the Government securities and here they own approximately 55 percent of the Government securities.

Mr. HAYDEN. I was more liberal than was the Senator. I said that the banks in Great Britain hold 15 percent of the Government securities. But, whatever the percentage may be, the fact remains that our banking resources are four and a half times as great as are the British banking resources.

Mr. GLASS. That I will not deny; but I do challenge the statement that Government securities are liquid and can be disposed of for cash at any time. They cannot be at all.

The Federal Reserve banks own two billion and a half of Government securities, and they do not dare put them on the market, because to do so would destroy the Government bond market and ruin the Government's credit.

Mr. HAYDEN. But I must insist that exactly the same situation exists in Great Britain; and if British banks, holding the vast amounts which they do in British bonds, were to dump them on the market on any one day they would break the market value of those bonds.

Mr. GLASS. And they own only 11 percent of the British Government's securities.

Mr. HAYDEN. A significant comparison, which gives some indication of the extent to which our public debt is a burden to the people, is a comparison of the interest and amortization charges which must be paid on it in relation to the national income out of which the payments are made. The total interest and amortization charges on the United State national debt for the calendar year 1933 were $1,048,000,000 and $1,289,000,000 for 1934. In 1933 the interest and amortization charges on our national debt amounted to less than 3 percent of our national income, while in England such charges amounted to between 8 and 9 percent of the national income.

Another significant comparison is that between the size of the debt of all public bodies and the amount of annual income. The best estimates for 1934 indicate that the debt of all our public bodies, national, State, and local, was about 95 percent of our annual national income, while the corresponding figure for England was approximately 230 percent of the British national income. The conclusion is inevitable that the burden of the English debt on the British people is certainly much greater than is ours on the people of America. I am told that the debt of the Australian Commonwealth and the Australian state governments amounts to almost three times the national income of Australia.

It is interesting to note, as was pointed out in this statement by the Royal Bank of Canada, that in order for our national debt to bear the same relation to our national income as the English national debt bears to the English national income, it would have to be increased to over $100,000,000,000.

The figures cited show that, while our banks hold a larger proportion of the national debt, their holdings constitute a smaller proportion of their total loans and investments. The fact is that, by any measure we can devise, the public-debt burden on this country is much smaller than is that of England on the English people.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does the Senator intend to give, or has he given, the comparative figures as to other countries than England?

Mr. HAYDEN. I have a table here which I shall quote in just a moment. It is not, however, very recent.

Mr. BARKLEY. My recollection is that in a publication recently issued there is a comparison of our public debt, based on population and on income, with that of other nations, which shows that, by any comparison, it was smaller, by a considerable percentage, than that of any other country that might be fairly compared with ours, including England, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, and all the others of the first-class nations.

Mr. HAYDEN. With the international currency disturbed as it is, it is very difficult to make a factual comparison. However, I have here a table which cites the relative position of the United States and several other countries in 1929, or 5 years ago. While the emergency expenditures made during the last 4 years affect these figures, they, nevertheless, clearly indicate the basic economic situation of our country and other countries so far as material wealth is concerned. In that year the wealth per capita of the United States was $3,259; in the United Kingdom of Great Britain it was $2,514; in Canada it was $2,827; in France it was $1,653; and in Italy, $723.

The per capita public debt, including local debts, in the United States then was $243; in the United Kingdom, $938; in France, $450; and in Italy, $233.

The income per capita of the United States for that year was $734; in England it was $415; in France it was $219; and in Italy, $120. Any comparison made at any time between our resources and those of other nations in the world clearly demonstrates our ability to meet the debt which we have incurred or which we are likely to incur during the depression.

The tabulation is as follows:

Country	Wealth per capita	Public debt per capita (including local debt)	Percent of debt to wealth	Income per capita
United States	$3,259	$243	7.5	$734
Canada	2,827	474	16.8	571
United Kingdom	2,514	938	37.3	415
France	1,653	450	27.2	219
Italy	723	233	32.2	120
Japan (proper)	636	59	9.3	79

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. Is it not true that if we increase the public debt of $34,000,000,000 the interest rate will be approximately $1,000,000,000 a year, which will necessitate that the first item of appropriation each year must be 33 cents out of every dollar of normal income so as to pay the interest, without any allowance for a sinking fund?

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator's figures are not quite large enough. The interest charge on the national debt already amounts to more than $1,289,000,000 a year.

Mr. BYRD. On the present basis?

Mr. HAYDEN. On the present debt.

Mr. BYRD. With a normal income of approximately $3,000,000,0000 then we will have to write as the Senator's estimate that approximately 40 cents out of every dollar of normal income must go to defray interest charges without a single dollar being set aside for a sinking fund.

Mr. HAYDEN. When the Senator refers to the normal income he undoubtedly has in mind the income for the present fiscal year. I have in my mind a summary of the British Tax System, with Special Reference to Its Administration, prepared for the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation by Mr. Magill, Mr. Parker, and Mr. King, the very able employees of that committee. I am going to include as an exhibit to my remarks an extract from this pamphlet which I am sure Senators will read with interest.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection the extract will be printed at the conclusion of the speech of the Senator from Arizona.

(See Exhibit A.)

Mr. HAYDEN. I asked a member of that committee, one whom we all know very well, Mr. L. H. Parker, to furnish me a statement, which I am sure will be helpful to the Senator from Virginia. I shall put his letter in the RECORD. He states, for instance—

> That the 1918 income- and profits-tax rates on individuals and corporations if continuously applied for subsequent years would have extinguished the national debt by July 1, 1927.

Those rates were the high war rates. If we had kept them in force, we would have paid the entire national debt within 8 or 9 years.

He also states—

> That the 1919 income- and profits-tax rates on individuals and corporations if continuously applied for subsequent years would have extinguished the national debt by July 1, 1931.

I ask that the entire letter from Mr. Parker may be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit B.)

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, let me ask, When does the Senator from Arizona think the present national debt can be extinguished?

Mr. HAYDEN. We are going to extinguish the national debt by balancing the Budget and having money left over with which to pay it.

Mr. BYRD. When does the Senator favor balancing the Budget?

Mr. HAYDEN. As soon as we possibly can. There are two ways of balancing the Budget, either to increase——

Mr. VANDENBERG. We are now following two ways of balancing it, are we not?

Mr. HAYDEN. We may either increase the revenues or decrease the expenditures. Those who so earnestly urge that governmental appropriations be reduced, as was done in Great Britain, seldom say much about levying the taxes which are imposed in that country. They demand that public works shall cease, but squirm when the English income-tax rates are mentioned. Of course, Congress will have to levy taxes to pay off the deficits now being incurred, which are added to the public debt. The best time to impose such taxes is when the country is prosperous. Our hindsight is better than our foresight, but it is generally admitted that a mistake was made during the Harding and Coolidge administrations by not maintaining higher rates of Federal taxation in order more speedily to pay off the national debt. Instead of doing so Congress listened to "the greatest Secretary of the Treasury since Alexander Hamilton", who, with his usual tenderness for those who possess great wealth, advised the Congress to reduce taxes. If that had not been done, and if we had disregarded the advice of Mr. Mellon, the national debt would not be nearly so great as it is today.

Mr. COUZENS. Mr. President——

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

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. COUZENS. May I point out to the Senator that the Democratic members of the Finance Committee joined with Mr. Mellon in meeting the request for a reduction in taxes, and the records will show that they even wanted to go lower than did Mr. Mellon.

Mr. HAYDEN. I have no doubt that the Senator from Michigan makes a very correct statement, but we were living then in an era when sound finances were not considered, when it was taken for granted that the prosperity then enjoyed would continue forever. Congress should have kept the income-tax rates up. I confess that a mistake was made. We should not have followed Mr. Mellon's advice. All those who ultimately went broke playing the stock market during the feverish years of speculation would have been no worse off in the end if they had been compelled to pay a greater part of their winnings to reduce the national debt.

The statement is made in the letter from Mr. Parker to which I have referred that if we now had the 1927, 1928, and 1929 national income, the existing tax rates on the statute books today, instead of bringing in $3,000,000,000, which is the standard by which the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] measures our national income, they would produce $6,000,000,000. In other words, it is not so much a question of balancing the Budget by cutting down expenditures, but of collecting taxes from a people who are able to pay. The Treasury is able to do that in prosperous times, and we should have taxed ourselves more in the years of prosperity than Congress did. If Congress had done that, we would not have as great a national debt as now exists. As the country comes back into prosperity, Congress can go about reducing the national debt without serious injury to American industry, without hardship to the American people. I do not believe it will be necessary to go as high as England has in the matter of rates; but, if necessary, I am willing to go as high as the British rates, when our taxpayers can afford to pay them.

Mr. COUZENS. If the Senator's contention is that there is an upturn of business and that we should take advantage of the upturn by collecting the taxes, it would seem to me we ought to take advantage of the upturn of business and get the money while the getting is good.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator is making his argument apply to an amendment to this joint resolution which he has pending. I have not made a very careful study of his proposal. I say we should pay as we go as far as we are able to pay. I voted for what appeared to be very high taxes during the World War. I am sure that our Government, better than any other government, paid its way during the war, and still the United States had to go into debt.

According to the report to the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, if the United States can again attain a national income comparable to that which was secured prior to the depression, the existing rates will produce not $3,000,000,000 as a normal tax, but $6,000,000,000 each year. If it is the desire of the Senator from Michigan to take $7,000,000,000 or $8,000,000,000 or $10,000,000,000 away from the American people, I have no doubt he can find a rate that will do it. The question is whether it is wise to do that at this time or whether it is better to wait until the country stands more solidly on its feet and is, therefore, better able to pay.

Mr. COUZENS. Of course, politically it is wise to put off such an operation as long as possible.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator has said there is a growing improvement in business and that in normal times the present income of $3,000,000,000 would be increased to $6,000,000,000. The actual receipts for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1934, were only $2,949,000,000. Evidently the improvement that has occurred in the country, to which the Senator has called attention, has not been very great.

Mr. HAYDEN. All I know about that is, like Will Rogers, what I read in the newspapers, and the late reports are that the income-tax returns filed on the 15th of March show higher receipts than were expected.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. HAYDEN. Certainly.

Mr. MURPHY. The income taxes collected show an increase of 30 percent for the calendar year 1934.

Mr. BYRD. But that was an increase over the previous year and not an increase over the estimates upon which the Budget was based.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Treasury has depended ordinarily and very largely upon the income taxes paid by individuals and corporations, and excess-profits taxes. In the normal years of 1926, 1927, and 1928 there was collected over $2,000,000,000 from such sources. When the panic struck the country, when the depression came on, profits ceased and income from those sources dropped down to about $600,000,000. It was not an increase in public expenditure that unbalanced the Budget during the Hoover administration. It was a decline in revenue. There is no dispute about that.

Mr. BYRD. It is an increase in expenditures now that is unbalancing the Budget, because we are spending $9,000,000,000 and the total income of the country is only $4,000,000,000, including the processing taxes.

Mr. HAYDEN. I am sure I would not and I doubt if any other Senator would propose to levy a tax sufficient in 1 year to collect that sum of money. The Senator from Virginia would not vote for such a tax.

Mr. BYRD. I should like to call the attention of the Senator that a sales tax has been suggested, but it would take a 36-percent sales tax to balance the Budget this year, because 1 percent would derive a revenue of only $250,000,000.

Mr. HAYDEN. I am not in favor of a national sales tax.

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

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I understood the Senator to say there were only two ways possible for us to work out of the difficulty in which we find ourselves at the present time. One is by raising the tax rates in the hope of raising more revenue and thereby balancing the Budget. The second way is to cut down the expenditures, which means reduced appropriations. Are those the only two ways the Senator has in mind for assisting, at least, to work out of the depression?

Mr. HAYDEN. I was referring to balancing the Budget. We were discussing that particular problem. Congress can balance the Budget either by increasing revenue or by reducing expenditures.

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

Mr. HAYDEN. Certainly.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Is it not a fact that unless times get better and the people have more money, the increasing of tax rates would not necessarily raise additional revenues?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is completely proven by the fact that the existing rates, with a lack of profit on the part of the great majority of the American people, resulted in lower revenues.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Then the other remedy is the reducing of appropriations. I think the Senator will remember we have made an effort in past years to follow that plan, and that practically every time we have reduced any particular item the next Congress or perhaps the same Congress would restore the item, having particularly in mind the economy bill. The second remedy, while it is possible, therefore, is not practicable.

The only remedy the Senator can urge is the one to bring back prosperity to the country whereby and wherein and whereunder the people can make some profits, and, when they have the profits, to take the tax under the rates we now have on our statute books. If the people can get some prosperity back, the Senator maintains we have sufficient rates to raise sufficient funds to balance the Budget. Have I correctly interpreted the Senator's views?

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator has done so.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. LEWIS. I wish to ask the able Senator from Arizona—who has given such diligent study to the subject before the Appropriations Committee—on what theory of American government that which is called "balancing a budget" is at all necessary either to the institutions of the United States or the prosperity of the people? Where does this "balancing a budget" become in itself a necessary instrument or a necessary undertaking to provide for the people of America?

Will not the Senator say that "balancing a budget" only applies when conditions are normal and intended to apply to normal circumstances? When we contemplate that the drought alone would have made it impossible for the United States to balance any budget this last year, based on the theory of announcing what would be the needed taxes on the one hand and what would be the needed expenditures on the other, assuming that to be a balance, I ask the Senator from Arizona if it is not true that these extraordinary conditions are such as to make inapplicable a doctrine of "balancing the Budget" under the theory of doing the thing necessary as it arises. Is this not the true policy of our Government?

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator is perfectly correct. There is no virtue in balancing the Budget merely to have it in balance. On the other hand, no government should deliberately go into debt——

Mr. LEWIS. Unnecessarily?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes; unnecessarily. That is just as true of a government as it is of an individual, because debt is a tyrant that should be avoided. The day of reckoning always comes. What is easy to borrow is hard to repay. Certainly not a dollar of borrowed funds should be wasted, because to it is attached the burden of future taxes to replace it in the Treasury.

I point out to my friend from Illinois, however, that the ability to go into debt, while not always, may sometimes be a blessing. If one is hungry, he is entitled to credit wherewith

to purchase food, particularly if there is any reasonable possibility that the loan may be repaid. When the life of a government is at stake, as in the case of war, it must borrow or perish. If the people of a country are in great distress, any reasonable increase in the public debt is justifiable to tide over the period of their suffering. That, and no more, is what our Government has done for the American people up to this time. We can look with confidence to a future when every dollar borrowed by the United States Government will be repaid by imposing no more of a tax burden than can be carried without undue hardship—a tax burden that need not be as large as that now imposed by Great Britain.

Mr. President, the sun rose yesterday. It rose today, and it will rise tomorrow.

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

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to call the Senator's attention to the fact that it also set on those 3 days. [Laughter.]

Mr. HAYDEN. Very true, because the night always follows the day. Nevertheless, as the night follows the day, so can we depend upon the courage, the industry, and the ability of the American people. We have within this Nation every resource to sustain a prosperous and contented population. The days of our distress will surely pass away. I fear that the Senator from Maryland is among those who have but little faith. Let me again urge him to be of good cheer. Nothing has yet happened, and nothing will happen, to destroy the credit of the American Government.

I thank the Senate.

EXHIBIT A

[From A Summary of the British Tax System With Special Reference to Its Administration, prepared by Roswell Magill, L. H. Parker, and Eldon P. King, for the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation]

III. GENERAL STATEMENT ON BRITISH TAX REVENUE

1. REVENUES

A fair idea of the importance of the various British National Government taxes may be obtained from an examination of the revenues derived from such taxes. This revenue is shown for the fiscal years 1932–33 and 1933–34 in the following table:

Classification of tax	Exchequer receipts	
	1932–33	1933–34
Income tax	£251,539,000	£228,932,000
Surtax	60,650,000	52,590,000
Death duties	77,140,000	85,270,000
Stamp taxes	19,220,000	22,710,000
Excess profits duty, etc. (back taxes)	2,200,000	1,800,000
Land tax and miscellaneous	770,000	800,000
Total internal revenue	411,519,000	392,102,000
Customs	167,235,000	179,177,000
Excise	120,900,000	107,000,000
Total customs and excise	288,135,000	286,177,000
Motor vehicle duties (exchequer share)	5,000,000	5,200,000
Grand total tax revenue	704,654,000	683,479,000

It is apparent from the above figures that the income and surtax form the most important source of the British tax revenue. The percentage of total tax revenue returned by each tax shown in the table already given is set forth below for 1933–34, the taxes being arranged in order of their productivity:

	Percent
Income and surtax	41.2
Customs	26.2
Excise	15.6
Death duties	12.5
Stamp taxes	3.3
Motor vehicles duties (exchequer share)	.8
Excess profits duty, etc. (back taxes)	.3
Land tax and miscellaneous	.1
Total	100.0

It will be interesting to compare the Federal revenue receipts with the British revenue receipts for the fiscal year 1934, as follows:

Percentage of yield of tax to total yield

Classification	United States [1]	British
Income and surtax	31.3	41.2
Customs	12.0	26.2
Excise	49.9	15.6
Death duties (and gift tax)	4.3	12.5
Stamp taxes	2.5	3.3
Miscellaneous		1.2
Total	100.0	100.0

[1] Processing tax not included in United States tax.

It can be seen from the above table that a greater proportion of the tax burden is placed on income in Great Britain than is placed on incomes in the United States. The customs collections are greater in Great Britain. Nearly 40 percent of the British customs collections, however, come from tobacco, while in the United States our customs collections from this source are comparatively small and we obtain a very large revenue from the excise tax on tobacco. The British derive little revenue from excise taxes on tobacco as practically no tobacco is grown in England. The British collected about twice as much from the estate duty than was collected in the United States. Total tax collections in Great Britain, however, amounted to $3,417,395,000 against $2,614,250,000 in the United States (processing taxes in the United States of $371,000,000 excluded). This represents a large difference in the tax burden imposed by the National Governments when it is recalled that the population of the United Kingdom is about 46,000,000 against about 126,000,000 for the United States. It must not be overlooked, however, that the local taxes in the United Kingdom are considerably less than in the United States.

We now come to the question of the total tax burden. In neither the United States nor Great Britain are the data covering local revenue or receipts entirely satisfactory or up-to-date. However, some close approximations of the total tax burden may be made.

Tax and customs revenue, United Kingdom, year 1933–34

Total National Government receipts, taxes, and customs	$3,417,395,000
Total local government receipts from taxes	[1] 1,142,425,000
Total	4,559,820,000
Per capita burden	99.11

Tax and customs receipts, United States, fiscal year 1934

Total National Government receipts, taxes, and customs	[2] $2,985,673,000
Total local government receipts from taxes	[1] 6,416,064,000
Total	9,401,737,000
Per capita burden	74.37

It can be seen from the above data that the per capita tax burden in Great Britain is about 33 percent more than the per capita burden in the United States. The British National Government collects about three times the amount collected by the local subdivisions. In the United States the reverse is true, and the local subdivisions collect over twice the amount of tax collected by the National Government.

2. EXPENDITURES

It should be noted, however, in connection with the fact that the per capita tax burden in the United States is considerably less than in the United Kingdom, that in respect to expenditures at this particular time a number of factors must be considered. Although between March 4, 1933, and June 30, 1934, the national debt had increased by about six billion, there are important offsets to this amount, including such items as an increase in cash balance, "profit" resulting from the change in the gold content of the dollar, securities consisting of notes and other obligations held by various agencies in which the Government has an interest, and projects financed in whole or in part from Federal funds. In making comparisons of the local and national tax burdens in the two countries it is difficult to give effect to the weights of these various factors. Therefore for present purposes they are eliminated, and the following comparisons are noted merely from the angle of actual expenditures:

Total expenditures

United Kingdom, year 1933–34:	
Total National Government expenditures, including grants to local governments	$3,467,095,000
Total local government expenditures, excluding expenditures out of grants from National Government	[3] 1,840,000,000
Total	5,307,095,000
Per capita expenditure	115

[1] Partly estimated and based on 1932–33 data.
[2] Includes processing taxes.
[3] Estimated and based on prior year figures.

Total expenditures—Continued

United States, fiscal year 1934:	
Total National Government expenditures	$7,105,050,000
Total local government expenditures	[2] 9,679,000,000
Total	16,784,050,000
Per capita expenditure	133

In respect to expenditures, therefore, it would appear that the per capita expenditure in the United States during the past fiscal year was about 16 percent more than the per capita British expenditure.

The above comparisons do not take into account certain receipts from interest, lands, tolls, etc., in the respective countries.

3. NATIONAL DEBT

It is perhaps fitting to compare the national debt of the United Kingdom and the United States, since the payment of these debts is an important consideration in connection with revenue requirements.

National debt

United Kingdom, Mar. 31, 1934:	
Total internal debt	$34,543,405,000
Total external debt	5,182,725,000
Total gross debt	39,726,130,000
Total net debt	39,111,650,000
Per capita debt	850
United States, June 30, 1934:	
Total public national debt	27,053,141,414
Per capita debt	215

It further may be estimated from reliable sources that the debt of the local subdivisions in the United Kingdom amounts to about $6,505,000,000, and in the United States to about $19,600,000,000. Accepting these figures as approximately correct, we may state the grand total of all public debts per capita in the two countries as follows:

Total per capita public debt

United Kingdom (national and local)	$991
United States (national and local)	370

It is obvious, therefore, that as to the total per capita public debt the United States is in a much better position than Great Britain.

To sum up the comparative revenue and financial situation of the United States and the United Kingdom, the following points will be briefly stated:

1. The total tax burden per capita is about 33 percent more in Great Britain than in the United States.

2. In respect to the relative productivity of the taxes imposed by the National Governments, there is comparatively little difference in the two countries, except that the United Kingdom derives somewhat more from death duties and income taxes in proportion to the total collection and somewhat less from excises than is the case in the United States.

3. The per capita expenditure in the United States is about 16 percent greater than the per capita expenditure in Great Britain.

4. The per capita public debt of the United Kingdom, including the debt of the local subdivisions, is approximately two and one-half times the per capita public debt of the United States and the States, including their local subdivisions.

EXHIBIT B

In accordance with your request, I have made an approximate computation, based on the assumption that increased tax rates would not materially retard business, which indicates:

(1) That the 1918 income and profits tax rates on individuals and corporations, if continuously applied for subsequent years, would have extinguished the national debt by July 1, 1927.

(2) That the 1919 income and profits tax rates on individuals and corporations, if continuously applied for subsequent years, would have extinguished the national debt by July 1, 1931.

In explanation of the above, I would state that the rates of tax in force for 1918 in the case of individuals consisted of a 6-percent normal rate on the first $4,000 of net income and 12 percent on the balance of the net income over $4,000. The surtax rates on individuals were graduated from 1 percent on net incomes in excess of $5,000 and not in excess of $6,000 to 65 percent in the case of net incomes in excess of $1,000,000. The 1918 rates on corporations consisted of a 12-percent standard rate and an excess-profits tax graduated to 65 percent, and also a war-profits tax which might reach 80 percent.

The rates of tax in 1919 consisted of a normal rate of 4 percent upon the first $4,000 of the net income in the case of individuals and 8 percent on the balance of the net income in excess of $4,000. The surtax rates for 1919 remained the same as for 1918. In the case of corporations, the standard rate of tax was 10 percent, the excess-profits tax was graduated to 40 percent, and the war-profits tax was not operative.

In respect to the computations upon which the estimates made are based, it is very difficult to submit these in any comprehensible form. Allowance has to be made for the decrease in income due to the payment of the prior year's tax and also account has to be taken of the fact that interest charges would be reduced by an earlier payment of the debt. As already stated, no allowance has been made for the possibility of a diminished business activity on account of the higher tax rates. It will be recalled that one argument made for lowering the taxes was that business would be stimulated. To what extent business actually was stimulated by the reduction of taxes is not a fact which can be mathematically demonstrated.

The following statistics may be of some interest to you:

The total receipts of the Federal Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, amounted to $6,694,000,000. This was the year of maximum collections.

The total receipts of the Federal Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932, amounted to $2,121,000,000. This was the lowest year of collections since 1917.

From the above two figures it is believed that possibilities of additional revenue can be visualized.

The total gross debt of the United States on June 30, 1919, amounted to $25,482,000,000. On June 30, 1930, the public debt amounted to $16,185,000,000. It can be seen, therefore, that the public debt was actually reduced about $9,000,000,000 in 11 years. The total gross public debt on January 31, 1935, amounted to $28,475,000,000. Our total tax and customs revenue for the fiscal year 1934 amounted to about $2,985,000,000. This comparatively small revenue was primarily due to reduced business profits. I have no doubt, if we now had business profits and volume of business equal to 1928 and 1929 levels, that even under existing rates our revenue would be nearly double, or close to $6,000,000,000.

[2] Estimated and based on prior year figures.

"ON OUR WAY" TO DELAWARE AND MOSCOW

Mr. SCHALL. Mr. President, perhaps no more widespread nationalistic plan of Federal socialism has yet been devised than the one under consideration, with the single exception of that presided over by the Soviet Executive Council at Moscow.

Neither Hitler nor Mussolini, as I understand, provides for taking over private enterprises under Federal ownership and operation. They grant private ownership and operation of industry in general. The only broad example of this new deal seems to be in Moscow.

The difference between the socialism of the Socialist party, as advocated by Norman Thomas, and as initiated by the "brain trust", here outlined, seems in the main to be this:

First. Thomas would go frankly before the American people with his socialist program, submit it to a popular referendum, and elect a Congress committed to it; whereas the "brain trust" of Franklin Delano Roosevelt would put over his plan sub rosa by the Delaware corporation route after the fashion of holding corporations.

Second. Norman Thomas would develop his program by acts of Congress, as provided in the Constitution. Franklin Roosevelt would accomplish a system of Federal socialism by the Fabian method, by successive Delaware incorporations and Executive decrees without the knowledge of Congress. Certainly no measure has been submitted to Congress that would contemplate public debate on a program of national socialism. I am certain that the White House does not desire to have me even now lay the plan before the Senate.

It seems to be plain that the 57 alphabetical bureau units—beginning A. A. A., C. W. A., N. R. A., and the rest—are preparatory steps for the socialistic regime to be perfected by successive Delaware and other State corporations.

Take the 700 codes of the N. R. A. They centralize the big corporations of a given industry into one compact industrial group for ready handling under a Delaware corporation. The small fellows are eliminated, cast into the junk pile, for efficiency and economy of Federal action. So this is to be the fate of N. I. R. A.—a Federal corporation or holding company incorporated in Delaware.

Take the A. A. A.—or Federal control of agriculture after the plan of Moscow. By an A. A. A. "emergency fund", now amounting to $1,300,000,000, a preponderating majority of cotton growers, grain, and livestock growers, are already subsidized into submission to Federal rulings with regard to production, acreage, crop plowing under, pig sabotage, cow decimation, and curtailment of crops. During recent months the A. A. A. control, through distribution of checks drawn on the Treasury "deficit", has been extended to tobacco—plug and smoking, wrapper and filler, down to the price of cigarettes, with "two-for-a-quarter" limit—peanuts, molasses, milk, bees and honey, citrus fruit, cherries, rice, sheep, beans, and now they propose to subsidize the potato growers in order to carry Idaho, Minnesota, Michigan, and Maine. By the time the A. A. A. has been incorporated under the laws of Dela-

ware—with a hundred millions for Farley patronage to man the corporation—an American farmer will not be able to hitch a mule to a corn plow without the authority of Under Secretary Rexford Guy Tugwell.

As in Soviet Russia, the American farmer will become a peasant—his status fixed under the corporation laws of Delaware. The American agricultural yeomanry, the freemen who once fought the battles of the Republic and "fired the shot heard around the world", will become the peasantry of a feudal lord, or a Federal boss, incorporated under the laws of Delaware.

Control of 7,000 national banks has been assured in advance by purchase of $1,200,000,000 of preferred shares by the Federal Government—the checks drawn against the Treasury "deficit", which is to be met by the "coming generation."

Director Eastman, Director General of Railroads through retiring the Interstate Commerce Commission, has just submitted his report urging Federal operation of railroads—and other public utilities will follow the same route—provided that Congress continues its present status of "rubber stamp lying down."

Unless we follow the suggestion of Secretary Wallace and turn over the American fleet and shipping to Great Britain, we shall have a Federal shipping corporation incorporated under the laws of Delaware.

In order that this program may be financed without debate and without undue public knowledge, we were prevailed upon, without material discussion, only as far back as January 30, 1935, to pass House bill 4304, which, as I observe by reference to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that day, raises the bond limit of $28,000,000,000, provided in time of war, to $45,000,000,000, or twenty billions above our World War peak.

Thus the "emergencies" created by the new-deal system are twenty billions more expensive—that is, to the coming generation—than a World War. And the whole bankrupt socialistic program is to be incorporated under the laws of the little State of Delaware.

Question 1. Who is going to pay the Federal taxes after the principal tax-paying industries and utilities have come under Federal dominion? The answer is, doubtless, the "forgotten man", namely, the consumer. He will pay for all of Farley's patronage.

Question 2. Who will pay off that forty-five billion national debt? Answer. The coming generation or some succeeding administration that has the idea of financial responsibility and realizes that to every nation, as to every man, there comes a pay day.

Is this program to be arrested? Are the American people to be given a voice? Is Congress to be consulted? Are we to pass upon this socialistic program by the Delaware corporation route and subject it to the provisions of the Constitution? Or has Congress abdicated and turned over all legislative functions to the White House and a Farleyized bureaucracy?

In this connection I desire to call the attention of the Chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], to a paragraph in a lecture delivered by Dr. Rexford Guy Tugwell on November 16, 1933, when Tugwell was a Government official, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture—an official document distributed by the Government—and ask him if his committee noted the following excerpt therefrom. I am incorporating in my remarks the following paragraph, found on page 19, of an address delivered by Assistant Secretary of Agriculture Tugwell only 14 months ago, and 8 months after the Roosevelt inauguration, and now available as a public document, a copy of which was obtained from the Department of Agriculture. Inasmuch as Tugwell is advertised as "brain truster no. 1" and frequently of late sits in the White House Cabinet meetings, this paragraph is illuminating. Says Tugwell:

> I have had a chance to see the truth of the saying that ours is a government of men. The fiction that it is a government of laws would, I think, never have attained its great prestige if the right men had been called to govern.

That is to say, if I may interrupt the Tugwell monologue, "government by laws", which means acts of Congress, is a fiction, and therefore Congress itself is the author of fiction, and fiction is not government.

Our great historic backwardness is due to the fact that we have not had the "right men." We have had such so-called "men" as Washington and Jefferson, John Marshall and Justice Hughes, Abraham Lincoln and Woodrow Wilson. Not till now have we had the "right men"—Franklin Delano Roosevelt and Rexford Guy Tugwell.

Tugwell then passes to the new deal and says:

> Much has been said lately of the new institutions which have been invented, of the changes which have overtaken hitherto accepted arrangements. It is possible to overemphasize this idea. In fact, a careful examination of the new legislation will disclose that its novel characteristic is its provision of freedom of action for those who do the acting.

Note the following sentence in Tugwell's official Government document:

> The powers granted are mostly permissive; the rules written are mandates for performance. Everything depends on men.

A splendid illustration, let me add, is the appropriation bill now before us. Roosevelt demands that $4,000,000,000 be voted to him in practically one lump sum, "subject to the allocation of the Executive."

Our "permissive" function goes so far that the White House demands that we leave the allocation of appropriations—a power hitherto exercised by Congress under the Constitution for 145 years—to one man—the Executive. The "fictional" lawmaking body is to abdicate.

> Ours is a government of men—

To h—— with the lawmaking body! "Government of laws" is a fiction, the Supreme Court of the United States to the contrary. So says Tugwell, who now sits in the President's Cabinet.

Under a system of "government by men" it was not necessary to bring before Congress and the people of the United States the question of Federal socialism. Those "men" simply incorporated their holding companies under the laws of Delaware, as other corporations do. That "fiction" the lawmaking Congress, and the people of the States whom Congress represents, has nothing to do. Our bureaucracy is incorporated under the laws of Delaware, where moth nor rust, the people nor Congress may not corrupt. Mr. Farley will attend to the rest.

Did the Members of the Senate note the following warning in the President's message of January 4?—

> Let him who, for speculative profit or partisan purposes, without just warrant would seek to disturb or dispel this assurance, take heed before he assumes responsibility for any act which slows our onward steps.

The "assurance" named in the preceding sentence was that the new deal up to date had the support of American "confidence and faith." Anyone seeking to "disturb or dispel" this assurance was warned to "take heed."

If a business man expresses fear that his "profit" might fade away through this socialistic scheme, or if a public official seeks to disturb this "confidence and faith" with "partisan purpose"—for example, if he belongs to the opposing political party, and sits on my side of the aisle—"let him take heed before he assumes responsibility for any act which slows our onward steps."

A Republican Member, a Progressive, a democratic Democrat—anyone except a "pork" Democrat—appears to be in the same danger as that tailor who was thrown into jail for pressing a suit for 35 cents when the code prescribed 40 cents.

In The Economic Consequences of the New Deal, by Benjamin Stolberg and Warren Jay Vinton, on the outside cover page appears this interesting sentence:

> There is nothing the new deal has so far done that could not have been done better by an earthquake.

It is plain that both the publishers and the authors are in danger of that White House threat—"Let him take heed." For aught I know I may myself be due for jail for "lese majeste."

In the secret sessions of diplomacy, the White House and State Department, in conference with Belgian diplomats, have consummated a tariff treaty which the diplomats declare will enrich both countries. All that was necessary to do was to eliminate the legislative branch of government from the tariff making, article I of the Constitution to the contrary notwithstanding.

In the Chicago platform of 1932, for which the President vowed he stood 100 percent, the tariff making was to be done by—

a fact-finding Tariff Commission free from Executive interference.

The new deal thus far has produced three tariff treaties, one each with Cuba and Brazil and the last with Belgium, of which the outstanding tariff-making feature is that the duties are fixed in star chamber without legislative "interference." Our Minnesota potato growers who are selling their potatoes for 12 cents a bushel will be glad to note that in the Cuban treaty the duty on potatoes has been cut from 70 cents to 35 cents.

Under article I of the new deal, accordingly, the power over revenue, formerly the first and chief power of Congress, is transferred to the White House. The same rule, apparently, applies to the power of government in the matter of appropriation, as witness the "four billion lump" appropriation "subject to the allocation of the Executive."

Though the Belgian Tariff Treaty does not come before Congress for consideration, I am assuming that we still have the power to speak about it in order that our constituents at home may know what has been done to them and their industries in this White House-Belgian star-chamber proceeding.

There is a 33⅓-percent reduction in our tariff duty on plate glass consumed by American farmers, wage earners, and country homes in the interest of Belgian labor.

There is a 25-percent cut on cement, asbestos, shingles, waterproof cloth, cordage, certain woven fabrics, and photographic paper, and on certain steel products, such as ingots, billets, die blocks, and boiler plate, which, though not commonly consumed in American homes, give employment to American labor, and therefore, under lower duties, will benefit Belgian labor and lead to further unemployment of American labor.

In exchange for these benefits to Belgian labor and capital, Belgium gives American "benefits" as follows:

Reduction of 15 percent on automobiles and parts, and on radios and parts, also a reduction on grapefruit, dried peaches, canned sardines, and prunes. On apples the Belgian duties are to be "frozen" at 20 percent. On lard and pork products, which we are now shipping in from Canada, silk hosiery, collars and cuffs, the Belgian duties are not changed, but the "quotas" are extended. On dictating machines the 9-percent luxury tax is "suppressed." Some 76 articles of commerce which affect 47 industries have been affected by this treaty.

That seems to be practically the extent of this great "tariff reform" by star chamber, so far as the contents thereof have leaked to the press. No American industry is given a hearing. The effects upon American labor will not be known until Belgian imports begin to come in to take the American market. It is assumed that our automobile and radio manufacturers, and our producers of grapefruit and sardines, will extend their Belgian trade, though if it is worth much to Americans no one knows it, except possibly a few auto salesmen abroad.

The anticipated "benefits" are supposed to extend to 47 Belgian products imported to an amount of $5,000,000, and now possibly to be doubled, thereby reducing the market for 47 American products on which American labor is employed. And for this Belgium reduces its duties on 22 items supposed to benefit American sales in Belgium to a like amount.

The State Department says this means—

More trade, more production, and more employment of labor in both countries.

That is to say, Belgium will get more labor employment in 47 industries in which American employment will be correspondingly depressed. And, vice versa, American labor will get more employment in making 22 products at the expense of Belgian employment. Thus when the Belgian Peter robs the American Paul, and vice versa, both get "more trade, more production, and more labor employment in both countries." And that is the new-deal system of tariff reform.

The Belgian Minister, in behalf of Leopold III, says that—

President Roosevelt has clearly seen that without foreign trade no real prosperity is to be dreamed of, and that it is a fallacy to imagine that one can develop exportation while keeping down importations to the lowest level.

Of course, the country will be glad to learn from Leopold III and his emissaries the true destiny of the new deal. The President's book entitled "On the Way" failed to state where the way led. It seemed to lead, first, to Fascist Rome, then to Nazist Germany, and, lastly, to Soviet Moscow, via Delaware. But it seems that the new-deal way leads to Belgium by giving Belgium lower duties in 47 industries.

Let us hope that this Belgian tariff will give this country such "work relief" that the President will not need that $4,000,000,000 "subject to the allocation of the Executive."

The President's book, On Our Way, does not tell us where the policy will lead, and no one yet who has read that book has ventured to suggest that it pointed anywhere.

The other day a sigh arose from the majority across the aisle, and the purport of that sigh was "the great trouble with our new deal is that we have no terminal facilities."

Let me point out that the new deal seems to have extensive "terminal facilities", all incorporated and ready for traffic, and that the location thereof is in Wilmington, Del.

The thirteenth century gave the English-speaking world that well-known charter known as "Magna Carta." It remains for the twentieth century to produce for the Government of the United States, and for the economic regulation of the world, not one charter, but six charters, which history may well describe as maximi cartorum, all domiciled in the little State of Delaware.

George Washington, so history records, crossed the Delaware over 150 years ago. But Franklin D. Roosevelt, with four of his Cabinet generals and nine bureau colonels, and with all patronage battalions that General Farley has had time to allocate, has been camped in Delaware, it seems, for over a year, just waiting for a lump sum "subject to the allocation of the Executive" before he begins his Delaware offensive operations.

George Washington, it seems, had no middle name. Not so with the new-deal incumbent. Even the 1 year and 4 months of his present occupation of Delaware entitles him to be known to history as "Franklin Delaware Roosevelt."

But the chief distinction between the Delaware hero of 150 years ago and the Delaware commander of today is in the mission. The mission of George Washington was to establish the principles of the Constitution. The mission of the new-deal leader today, as revealed by the provisions of the six Delaware charters, is to evade the Constitution and set up a dynasty of economic socialization embracing all industries, enterprises, and activities, in which "any corporation now or hereafter organized" may engage.

The powers assumed under these Delaware charters today, as distinguished from the simple democratic plan of 150 years ago, embrace all the socialistic powers of the Soviet Executive Council. Washington and his followers aimed to restore all the rights of liberty and property to the American people. The new-deal plan chartered in Delaware aims to take all liberty and property from the individual American citizen and confer these rights upon Federal boards incorporated in Delaware, along with such powers, as stated in one of these charters, as—

* * * may be delegated or assigned to, or conferred upon, the corporation by the President of the United States of America. * * *

There is another sharp distinction as between the term of Washington's commission and the tenure of new-deal power as now chartered in Delaware. Washington laid down his commission when the temporary "emergency" was crossed.

The "new dealers" of today, carrying 2-year commissions from Congress, go over into Delaware and incorporate themselves under a provision that reads:

This corporation is to have perpetual existence.

It is that provision which gives their new deal its long-sought "terminal facilities." They are all located in Delaware. We are "on the way," hell-bent for Delaware.

In Delaware, where holding companies and explosive companies have central offices, are the "terminal facilities" of the new deal.

If ever there was any doubt in the minds of the American people, or of their representatives in Congress, with regard to the wisdom of article I of the Constitution placing power over appropriations in the hands of the legislative branch of Government, that doubt would appear to be removed by recent demands and actions, as witness:

First. The demand of the President that $4,000,000,000 be turned over to him in one lump sum, "subject to the allocation of the Executive."

Second. The incorporation by members of the President's Cabinet and his bureau heads, through the medium of Delaware holding companies, of six quasi-governmental merger corporations seeking to give "perpetual existence" to temporary "emergency" bureaus as permanent barnacles on the United States Treasury.

We are confronted here today with a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 117) practically calling for "four billion lump", and neither the parentage of the resolution nor the purpose of it are divulged beyond the usual camouflage.

Frank R. Kent, in the Democratic paper, the Baltimore Sun, says:

The striking thing about the pending $5,000,000,000 work-relief bill continues to be the cloak of mystery with which the plans for the expenditure of this vast sum are enshrouded.

When the allocations of the appropriation are made by act of Congress, which has been the American custom for 143 years up to the present administration, there has been no "cloak of mystery." Every dollar of the appropriation is of public knowledge, and is discussed, first, in committee with hearings thereof, and then the appropriation bill runs the gantlet of public debate in both Houses. Use of the public funds when the expenditure is made pursuant to the Constitution is never enshrouded in a cloak of mystery, as found by Mr. Kent of the Baltimore Sun, and as known to Members of the Senate.

It is only when Congress follows the blind alley of the "brain trust" instead of the Constitution made by the people of the United States that we hear of huge lump sums, "subject to the allocation of the Executive", enshrouded in a cloak of mystery.

But we now see that even hocus pocus with the public funds cannot long remain a mystery, however clever the thin camouflage. It takes no Sherlock Holmes to unravel the skein of this "four billion lump" mystery. Police find there is no perfect crime. Auditors find there is no perfect embezzlement. Anyone can decipher the purpose of a large chunk of this "four billion lump" in the charter provisions of six Delaware holding companies incorporated by members of the Cabinet and by the bureau chiefs of this new deal Federal bureaucracy.

It is quite possible that the administration fears to expose its plan of socialization, revealed by these charters for permanent industrial corporations, even to the Senators and House Members of the Democratic Party. The White House may have cause to doubt that the party followers of Jefferson, Jackson, Cleveland, and Woodrow Wilson are ready yet to espouse a Socialist program which begins in Moscow and ends with a blind appropriation for Federal industrial mergers chartered in Delaware and other States.

Certainly nothing has appeared in the Democratic national platforms of the past 100 years which could be twisted into a plank carrying such an instruction as this, which seems to be the Delaware platform:

We demand the expansion of the Federal bureaucracy, whereby, under White House leadership, we may organize pursuant to the approved policy of Wall Street, a group of federalized Delaware holding companies with perpetual charters to operate all branches of manufacturing and public utilities in the United States, the Treasury paying the bills.

Nevertheless, that very thing has been done, as shown by the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 6, in which I have published—notwithstanding the official order, "Do not publish"—the photostatic copies of these charters for the complete socialization of American industry.

Four members of the President's Cabinet—Wallace, Ickes, Perkins, and Morgenthau, Jr.—are members of the first boards of directors of 5 of these Delaware holding corporations chartered for owning and operating manufacturing in-industries, and 2 of which are also to operate utilities and any other business in which corporations engage.

Secretary Ickes appears to be chairman of the board in three of these industrial and utility corporations—manned by Federal officeholders with corporate offices at 100 West Tenth Street, Wilmington, Del.

Secretary Wallace appears to be chairman of the board of the Commodity Credit Corporation, with Secretary Morgenthau as a member of the board.

In the first articles of the Federal Surplus Relief Corporation, filed October 4, 1933, Secretary Wallace is apparently chairman of the board, with Ickes and Hopkins making up the board of three. But the revised articles filed January 10, 1934, mentions Harry L. Hopkins as president and chairman of the board, with Secretaries Ickes and Wallace holding subordinate posts in the directorate.

In making up the boards and controlling officers of the six industrial and utility quasi-Government mergers incorporated in Delaware—including the Electric Home & Farm Authority, which has corporation offices in both Delaware and Tennessee—the administration seems to have resorted to the bureaus for official timber to the extent of using nine bureau chiefs—Hopkins, Kohn, Johnston, Chapman, Wilson, Walters, Lilienthal, A. E. and H. A. Morgan. Hopkins is head of the F. E. R. A., and Morgan of the T. V. A.

One of the interesting features of these Delaware charters is a provision like this, in the Federal Subsistence Homesteads Corporation:

Eighth. The private property of the stockholders shall not be subject to the payment of corporate debts to any extent whatever.

Doubtless our thrifty bureaucrats believe that the taxpayers of the United States should meet the losses, either out of the Treasury "deficit" or out of this "four billion lump", or some other lump.

The already delivered Subsistence Homestead Corporation began with an initial cash capital of $10,000, which doubtless came out of the United States Treasury. As shown by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. DICKINSON] in the RECORD of February 21, page 2390, it had purchased up to January 31, 1935, 59,292 acres of land to an amount of $1,445,739, which also came from the Treasury. Therefore, it is fairly plain that part of this "four billion lump", concerning which the Baltimore Sun has diagnosed a shroud of mystery, will go through the bookkeeping ledgers of this Delaware holding company, of which Harold L. Ickes is chairman of the board, with corporate office at 100 West Tenth Street, Wilmington. That is where Auditor General McCarl may have to go to verify the vouchers, if these "terminal facilities" receive from us the demanded subsidy.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. DICKINSON], and also the Senator from Michigan [Mr. COUZENS], and the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], have attempted to obtain enlightenment from the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES], who in many respects appears to be our "contact" with the White House, why the Government or its bureau heads are incorporating these Delaware industrials and utilities for the United States Treasury to finance.

My friend from California [Mr. JOHNSON] has put this question for administration authorities to answer:

Why should the United States Government go into a single State in the Union and organize corporations with the broadest conceivable powers for its different activities and different departments?

It is possible that the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], Chairman of the Senate Finance Com-

mittee, may be well informed, in part, in view of the fact that no less than six Delaware "homestead" corporations appear to be allocated to Mississippi, as follows:

Richton Homesteads of Mississippi, Inc., incorporated December 29, 1933.

Laurel Homesteads of Mississippi, Inc., incorporated December 29, 1933.

Meridian Homesteads of Mississippi, Inc., incorporated December 29, 1933.

McComb Homesteads of Mississippi, Inc., incorporated December 29, 1933.

Tupelo Homesteads of Mississippi, Inc., incorporated December 29, 1933.

Hattiesberg Homesteads of Mississippi, Inc., incorporated January 16, 1934.

Being Chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, and therefore on speaking terms with the White House, as well as distinguished senior Senator from Mississippi, doubtless he may be able to throw upon our deliberations that calcium of light which may enable us to know:

Why the United States Government, as the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] has pointedly inquired—

Should go into a single State in the Union and organize corporations with the broadest conceivable powers for its different activities and different departments?

It is also pertinent to the consideration of the joint resolution before us—House Joint Resolution 117—to know if the shroud of mystery surrounding this demand for $4,000,000,000 in one sum "subject to the allocation of the Executive" extends to financing these Delaware industrials and utilities, and thereby puts the United States Government into the "socialization" business as in Moscow.

I am wondering if there is a Senator, even on the other side of this aisle, who is not in the dark as to the undivulged purposes and employment of this four-billion allocation, as we, on this side of the aisle, and the general public are.

On Tuesday, the 19th, as I recall, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. LOGAN] found, if I may quote the RECORD:

The great trouble that I find with the new deal—and I am for it—is that we have never found any terminal facilities.

It would certainly, I fear, be of great satisfaction to him and to all other Members, if we found that the "terminal facilities" were the Delaware holding corporations which seek to involve the United States Government in government ownership and operation of every conceivable industry and utility in which corporations engage. Is Uncle Sam to find "terminal facilities" for public funds in Wilmington, Del.?

I was deeply impressed, as I am sure other Senators were, when the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. LOGAN] continued in these words:

We are sailing on an uncharted sea; we have no place where we are going to stop. I have been waiting and waiting for someone to say that we are going to this particular point and there we will anchor, our work will be done; but I have heard no such word.

In another section of his address, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. LOGAN] raises the following significant question:

Who can tell whether next year at this time we will be called upon to make another $5,000,000,000 appropriation?

If we are to finance all the kinds of corporations covered by the 10 pages of fine print of the six Delaware charters published on pages 1552–1561 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 6, the answer to the Senator's inquiry might be, "Yes; next year, and as long as the American people will stand for a Moscow regime of socialization, and for that kind of a Federal administration."

Such billions as may go into these Delaware subsidiaries of the new deal this year will be swallowed up in real-estate investment and overhead for the patronage "pork."

The $5,000,000,000 of next year will be swallowed up by contracts with the building and machinery corporations that have the proper "political pull" to land high bids over low-bidding competitors who neglect to subscribe to the "right" campaign fund.

If we are to sink our poor legislative powers under the Constitution in this uncharted sea of "socialization"—this four-billion lump is only the first drop in the Moscow-Tammany Hall bucket.

From Berlin comes the news that Chancellor Hitler has written for himself a huge "blank check", ostensibly for "work relief", the particulars of which are known only to himself and cabinet. The German public has received from the Chancellor, according to John Elliott in a special to the New York Herald Tribune, a communique stating that the Nazi Cabinet had authorized the Finance Minister to issue funds for the Government's "new plan" to an amount which is to be decided by Der Reichsfuehrer. That sounds almost like Washington, D. C.

It seems in Berlin, as here, the "new plan" had increased the unemployed this winter by 400,000 over the mark of a year ago. Hitler's so-called "new plan" had resulted in a "new deficit" of 2,000,000,000 marks and a new floating debt of 5,000,000,000 marks, or about $2,000,000,000. So Hitler writes for himself a new "blank check", supposed to be about half of that which the Senate is asked to vote in a lump, "subject to the allocation of the Executive."

Our uncharted seas have many of the aspects of the German North Sea. New deals which evade the Constitution are, in the last analysis, much alike. However, the German "new plan" does not call for the incorporation of industrial and utility holding companies with cabinet officials as the boards of directors. Our new deal of Federal socialization via Delaware seems to have been borrowed from the "new plan" of Soviet Moscow. What Moscow is to the U. S. S. R., the city of Wilmington, Del., seems to be to the "new deal" of the United States of America. However, Moscow puts on no cloak of mystery. The Soviet Executive Council frankly directs the writing of the check, and also tells the world what the check is for, namely, the socialization of all Russia. Here we have a crossword puzzle and a guess.

"FABIAN" APPROACH TOWARD "SOCIALIZATION"

The difference between the "new plans" in Europe—Rome, Berlin, and Moscow—and the new deal here is in the method of approach. We have on our side of the Atlantic the smiling exterior of beneficent paternalism and the billions in doles and the steady encroachment of the Federal Government over the industrials and utilities, over the railways and banks, and over all branches of agriculture and commerce, both interstate and intrastate; whereas "over there", in Rome, Berlin, and Moscow, there is the blunt appeal to force. In Europe the "new plans" may be effective through "shock troops", whereas here the more effective method is by subsidy and control of communications.

So our "new dealers" have adopted the method of Fabius Maximus, five times consul, twice censor, and dictator of Rome, in the third century B. C.

It will be recalled from our school-history days how Fabius Quintus, afterward known as Maximus, was the cautious general who defeated Hannibal in the second Punic War by harassing tactics which won for him the surname of "The Delayer." That appears to be the method employed by the White House to conquer the Senate on this "four billion lump" bill and the gradual socialization of American industry.

This Fabian approach to the socialization of the United States by the method of incorporating Delaware holding companies is not at all fanciful. It is a concrete actuality with a strong international organization behind it.

Doubtless no Senator here is unfamiliar with the history of that socialistic order known as the "Fabian Society." Among its best-known figures in the United Kingdom is George Bernard Shaw, just as among its best-known workers in the United States is Bernard M. Baruch. Former Representative McFadden, of Pennsylvania, for 11 years Chairman of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, has published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD during past years, even up to the RECORD of the Seventy-third Congress, hundreds of pages on the history of the Fabian Society, both abroad and in America.

The dominant idea of the Fabian Society, formally organized in 1883, is explained in its charter, which, to quote from the cyclopedia—

Aims of the reorganization of society by the emancipation of land and industrial capital from individual class ownership, and vesting of them in the community for the general benefit.

The cyclopedia tells us that the Fabian Society maintains "lectureships" and "watches and seizes its opportunities to achieve socialist results; hence its name."

Those who have followed the weekly lectures of Dr. Rexford Guy Tugwell, Under Secretary of Agriculture, and a weekly attendant at the President's Cabinet meetings, whose lectures are delivered from week to week in various parts of the country and then sent out from the Government Printing Office as public documents, will recognize Tugwell as conducting the principal "lectureship" of the Fabian Society in the United States. The so-called "brain trust", of which the founder was Bernard M. Baruch, with Tugwell as no. 1 spokesman, is nothing more nor less than the American edition of the Fabian Society, which today controls the new-deal policy of "bold experiments", the boldest of which is to control Congress and transfer its legislative functions to the White House.

Note that Fabius Maximus was twice censor and dictator of Rome. He invented the Fabian method of harassing the enemy by feints, false rumors, and delays—the methods of the Fabian Society in getting control of government and aiming at reorganization of society by collectivist control of land and industrial capital and the overthrow of individual ownership and operation.

If one wishes all the industrial ownership aims of the Fabian Society in America, all he has to do is to read the dozen pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 6, 1935, published by my persistent effort, reproducing the six Delaware charters for socialization of American industry—in all, 75 sections and 119 subsections—embracing the whole program of both the Fabian Society of Europe and also the soviet system of state socialism.

Astounding as this revelation may appear to all imbued with American ideas of liberty and property, the significant fact is that each of these Delaware charters bears the signatures, over their oaths and notarial seals, of members of the President's Cabinet and chiefs of his alphabetical bureaus.

If one reads the 194 provisions of these quasi-governmental socialistic charters, he must say:

Well, here is the complete program of the Fabian Society of Europe. There is not an industrial, financial, or commercial enterprise or activity that is omitted. Here is the Fabian plan of society complete.

Then we begin reading the names of the signers and incorporators:

H. A. Wallace, Oscar Johnston, H. Morgenthau, Jr., Harold L. Ickes, Frances Perkins, Robert D. Kohn, and again the last three repeated, Harry L. Hopkins, Harold I. Ickes, Henry a Wallace, and again the last three repeated, in different order, Harold L. Ickes, Oscar L. Chapman, M. L. Wilson, Arthur E. Morgan, Harcourt A. Morgan, David E. Lilienthal, and finally, Harold L. Ickes, Oscar L. Chapman, T. A. Walters.

All of these signatures are duly witnessed and carry the notarial seals. The charters and two amended versions bear the notarial legend:

Given under my hand and seal of office the day and year aforesaid.

Then appear, attached to the respective documents, the names of District of Columbia notaries in seven instances where Federal officials sign, the name of a New York notary in the case of Lilienthal, and the name of a Tennessee notary in the case of the Morgans.

But all of these quasi-government Delaware mergers have a corporate office with the Corporate Trust Co., resident agent, "No. 100 West Tenth Street, in the city of Wilmington, New Castle County, State of Delaware."

Members of the Senate, at least on the other side of the aisle, may desire to write to these Fabian society corporations there. Be sure to read the text of the published charters in order to get the name of the right Cabinet official to address as "president" or "chairman of the board."

If Senators read section "fourth" of the charter of the Commodity Credit Corporation, page 1552 of the RECORD, they will note that 30,000 shares are issued, par value $100 per share, aggregate par value $3,000,000.

The 30,000 shares of this first Fabian corporation seem to be based upon the count of 3,000 counties in the 48 States, or 10 shares to each county.

If my amendment is adopted to House Joint Resolution 117, prohibiting allocation of public funds to any new-deal corporation, except by express authorization of Congress, there will be no "preferred", no dividends, no Government ownership or operation, and not even an army of the politically employed for Mr. Farley to "allocate."

Let me sketch the nature of the business of these respective Delaware corporations having Federal Cabinet members for presidents or chairmen.

If you own a share or shares in the Commodity Credit Corporation—H. A. Wallace chairman of the board—you are engaged in—see subsection k—

Handling, carrying, processing, manufacturing, storing, preparing for markets, and marketing agricultural and/or other commodities and/or products thereof.

Therefore, you may be running a grain elevator, flour mill, breakfast-food factory, packing house, a smokehouse for razorbacks, a cotton gin, or a tobacco factory.

Your corporate place of business may be in any State or Territory, or, we are told, in any of the "colonies of the United States." This term "Colonies of the United States" is a new-deal term that began with the reign of Roosevelt II.

Moreover, your place of business as a socialistic owner—see subsection 1—may be outside the United States or even its "colonies", as witness this addendum—

and in any and all foreign countries.

This might include Japan, Russia, or Manchukuo, where a Japanese "brain trust" maintains Emperor Pu Ji on a puppet throne at the capital, Hsingking—which, in American, means the same as Sing Sing. One of the advantages of being a stockholder in this Delaware corporation might be the chance to junket abroad on one of the new-deal battleships.

Besides being engaged in manufacturing "agricultural and/or other commodities and/or products thereof", the investor—subsection d—acquires power "to borrow money * * * without limit as to amount"—and also—subsection f—"to loan money"—though the term "without limit" fortunately does not attach to loans.

These financial powers will be of great political value; provided, of course, my amendment should not be adopted.

Among the other functions of this Commodity Credit Corporation, incorporated in Delaware, is to give "perpetual existence" to the A. A. A., the N. R. A., the F. E. R. A., the R. F. C., the E. R. A., and other obnoxious alphabetical emergency institutions.

In going after votes and patching up political fences, the administration never knows how many alphabetical emergency powers he is going to need.

Certain investors may be so fortunate as to be one of the three preferred stockholders of the Public Works Emergency Housing Corporation, which has unlimited powers—see subsection 1—

Delegated or assigned to, or conferred upon, the Corporation by the President of the United States of America.

This Corporation has power—

(4) To manufacture, buy, sell building or other materials and supplies of every kind, nature, and description.

It also has the power to go into the public-utility field—

(7) to furnish, equip, operate * * * without limitation the supplying of heat, steam, water, gas, and electricity, and transportation, telephone, and any other facilities necessary, suitable, or convenient.

All of which might come in handy in a campaign. If the powers conferred upon this Corporation by the President, however, work like other P. W. A. enterprises, the State of Minnesota or Louisiana might have different powers from those conferred, for example, on Mississippi and Arkansas.

However, this Corporation in its charter powers defined in its original charter of October 27, 1933, as Chairman Ickes will inform you, engages in the following broad field of manufacturing industries:

(4) To manufacture * * * building materials and other products of every kind, nature, or description, including without limitation, iron, steel, granite, stone, brick, cement, wood, paper, and plaster.

So here is an industrial investment which might fit the requirements of a Senator from Pennsylvania or Colorado, from New York or Alabama, though it might not be so useful to a Senator from Louisiana, except in the item of "plaster." For further information on this Corporation, please write Chairman Ickes at 100 West Tenth Street, Wilmington, Del., or his Delaware secretary, Robert D. Kohn, or call up the post office and ask for General Farley, particularly as to building materials, by advice of the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG].

For the best investment information with regard to the Federal Surplus Relief Corporation, Chairman Harry L. Hopkins of the F. E. R. A., is the official source, though either of his assistants, Harold L. Ickes and Henry A. Wallace, may doubtless serve the same end. In all cases, address them at their corporate office, 100 West Tenth Street, Wilmington, Del. This Corporation also has unlimited power to borrow or loan money, deal in capital stock or bonds, engage in "processing" and "manufacturing", and furthermore is world-wide in its international operations, as witness its business "without limit" in subsection—

(t) To have one or more offices, to carry on all or any of operations or business and without restriction or limit as to amount, in any of the States, districts, territories, or colonies of the United States, and in any and all foreign countries.

So this Corporation could have offices in Moscow itself, and could be making loans to the Soviet Executive Council out of our unlimited Treasury "deficit." Farley is already hauling mail into Soviet Russia by way of Alaska.

When Secretary Wallace, assistant to Chairman Hopkins, wrote his book America Must Choose, he may have had in mind the question whether the foreign office of this "Federal Surplus Relief Corporation" was to be located in Rome, Berlin, or Moscow, or, on the other hand, in one of the "colonies" of the present dynasty, such as Cuba when Wall Street and the United States Navy complete their political demonstrations down there. Therefore, "America must choose."

Mr. President, there is no need to go farther in the enumeration of this dreary list. Senators have eyes to see for themselves what 194 sections and subsections of these six Delaware charters call for.

They call for as complete a socialization of America as the Soviet program of Russia. He who votes public funds "subject to the allocation of the Executive" to these holding companies of the new deal is not only "on our way" to Delaware but he is on the way to Moscow.

These Delaware charters are plainly based on the powers of Stalin and his 17 commissars over Russian industry. Any billion voted "subject to the allocation of the Executive", who by his Executive orders and executive bureaus created these Delaware political mergers, is a billion to convert the United States of America into imitation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

These Delaware charters disclose whither we are "on our way", just as the President's book enshrouds the way in a cloak of mystery. Do we propose to pave the way to Delaware with public funds? If not, then vote for my amendment, which restricts all appropriations for work-relief projects to those projects for which Congress has expressly authorized expenditure.

If we are to finance the "terminal facilities" of the new deal out of revenue collected from taxpayers, it is our sworn duty under the Constitution to specify both the amount and the project. To do otherwise is to betray our constituents. Once the avenues of information are cleared of the present censorship, there is no cloak of mystery that will long enshroud those who deliberately usurp the Constitution and betray our country into the socialistic regime of a Delaware-chartered Soviet.

I cannot conceive of any one here knowingly embarking on such an enterprise. Then, if not, the time has come to chart our course to a known port. Are we for America or for Moscow via Delaware? Are we "on our way"—and whither? Are we statesmen or just drifters? Are we "on the way" to Moscow via Delaware?

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. DICKINSON] laid before us on February 21, as appears on page 2390 of the RECORD, a chart showing last year's land acquisitions for new-deal terminal facilities.

He showed that the F. E. R. A. had bought 15,470,000 acres for $68,241,000.

He showed that Emergency Conservation had bought 7,584,000 acres for $24,000,000.

He showed that subsistence homesteads had bought 59,292 acres for $1,445,000.

All of these temporary "emergency" bureaus are incorporated in Delaware under charters which read:

This Corporation is to have perpetual existence.

If we put through this $4,000,000,000 lump sum "subject to the allocation of the Executive", we vote not only to acquire the lands for "terminal facilties", under the Delaware charter provisions, "to acquire improved or unimproved real estate", but we lay the foundations and start the superstructures under another provision of these charters, which reads:

To construct, reconstruct, alter, or repair, or to aid financially or otherwise in the construction—

And so forth.

Thus by 1936 we may have not only the terminal facilities but the first equipped traffic lane to give the people of the United States a joy ride into the summer resorts of "socialization" or into the winter resorts of Siberia.

The $45,000,000,000 bonded-debt limit voted a few days ago looks like a trip into Siberia. Think of it! The war-time limit for second Liberty bonds was $28,000,000,000, whereas the peace-time limit for socialization is expanded to billions far above the peak of the World War!

Having exhausted the confidence of investors, the administration now is preparing, under the guidance of Secretary Morgenthau and F. E. R. A. Administrator Hopkins, a "baby bond" campaign to unload the goldless flat bond inflation on the younger generation, who will have these millstones of interest burdens around their necks throughout their natural lives, and then will be compelled to hang the principal of those debts on the necks of their children or grandchildren—unless and until the people of the United States follow the illustrious example of our debtor nations abroad, and repudiate the bonds, and throw the "brain trusters" into a mill pond.

So we have the terminal facilities of the new deal, or a part of them. This bill is the first call to get out the transportation. Are we ready for the ride?

Are we "on the way" to Delaware? Have we a through ticket to Moscow? Are the people ready to give up their liberty and their property, and join on the long socialistic trip that leads to Moscow, perchance to Siberia? Or are we hiding that ticket in a cloak of mystery?

The sign "Do not publish" demands explanation. We have had none. The expansion of the debt limit to $45,000,000,000 is certainly a caution sign. The fact that during the past year, when the administration lay camped in ambush in Delaware, investment in industrial common stocks declined one-half compared with 1933, and was 100,000,000 shares less than in 1932, showing that someone already has "smelled a rat." Someone suspects there is something rotten in Delaware, notwithstanding the hitherto excellent reputation of Delaware. These Government charters have made Delaware smell like the traditional odor of Denmark.

If we are not "on the way" to Delaware, then let Senators vote for my amendment prohibiting all expenditure of public funds in terminal facility or other projects except as ex-

pressly authorized by Congress under the terms of the United States Constitution.

FREE SPEECH

Mr. COSTIGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD an Associated Press dispatch from New York, of March 16, 1935. It purports to quote the noted British visitor, author, economist, and lecturer, John Strachey, in denial of the charge recently made against him that he is a member of the Communist Party.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEWIS in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Colorado?

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

BELIEF IN VIOLENCE DENIED BY STRACHEY—WRITER ALSO SAYS HE WAS NEVER A MEMBER OF COMMUNIST PARTY

NEW YORK, March 16.—John Strachey, the British author and economist, arrived in New York tonight from Detroit and the middle-western scenes of his attempted deportation with fresh denials of alleged Communist affiliations.

"I was never a member of the Communist Party", he said, "nor have I applied for membership."

Strachey is threatened with deportation because of replies the Government says he made to the customary questions asked upon his entry into the country for a lecture tour.

"I said in my answers to the questionnaire", said Strachey, "that I am not a polygamist nor an anarchist and that I do not intend to overthrow the United States Government by force or violence. I repeat that declaration now."

Mr. COSTIGAN. Mr. President, one may well ask in these troubled hours, what has become of certain fundamental pillars in the temple of American liberty. Have they been destroyed, or merely covered over by the dust of a heedless and forgetful generation? Are they no longer significant for the lives and well-being of mankind? Is freedom not precious in its own right? Or are we merely blinded for the moment by an avalanche of stormy economic forces?

The recent hue and cry over the reported frank thinking and speaking of Mr. Strachey provides one of the latest reasons for soul-searching in America. Whether he is a Communist or not I have not the slightest idea, except that he says he is not; but have we reached a pass in this country when we may not discuss governments, their merits and demerits, and their relation to human welfare the world round without inviting the haunting presence and heavy hand of espionage and repression?

A great American, who for years before his recent death was hailed and is now mourned throughout the world, especially in all Anglo-Saxon countries, as one of the noblest jurists in history, held other views of the place of American constitutional principles in the sun. Lest we forget, I think it appropriate that we should recall some of his words by placing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as I now request leave to do, his carefully formulated views, as expressed in two notable cases, one decided in 1919, the other in 1928. The first was *Abrams* v. *U. S.* (250 U. S. 616), in which his dissent begins at page 624; the second, *U. S.* v. *Schwimmer* (279 U. S. 644), where his statement commences at page 653. In the former case, the United States Supreme Court had before it indictments and convictions of Russian-born persons, who in 1917 printed and circulated leaflets vigorously criticizing America's refusal to protest intervention by the Allies in Russia. In part, it warned the workers in ammunition factories that they were producing bullets and cannon not only to murder Germans but Russians fighting for freedom. It also strongly criticized the President of the United States.

The United States Supreme Court upheld the convictions, but Mr. Justice Holmes and Mr. Justice Brandeis, for reasons stated, insisted that the evidence that the defendant aliens were anarchists was slight. In his dissenting opinion, Mr. Justice Holmes made some statements which I ask to have incorporated in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

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

In this case sentences of 20 years' imprisonment have been imposed for the publishing of two leaflets that I believe the defendants had as much right to publish as the Government has to publish the Constitution of the United States now vainly invoked by them. Even if I am technically wrong and enough can be squeezed from these poor and puny anonymities to turn the color of legal litmus paper—I will add, even if what I think the necessary intent were shown—the most nominal punishment seems to me all that possibly could be inflicted, unless the defendants are to be made to suffer not for what the indictment alleges but for the creed that they avow—a creed that I believe to be the creed of ignorance and immaturity when honestly held, as I see no reason to doubt that it was held here, but which, although made the subject of examination at the trial, no one has a right even to consider in dealing with the charges before the court.

Persecution for the expression of opinions seems to me perfectly logical. If you have no doubt of your premises or your power and want a certain result with all your heart you naturally express your wishes in law and sweep away all opposition. To allow opposition by speech seems to indicate that you think the speech impotent, as when a man says that he has squared the circle, or that you do not care whole-heartedly for the result, or that you doubt either your power or your premises.

But when men have realized that time has upset many fighting faiths they may come to believe even more than they believe the very foundations of their own conduct that the ultimate good desired is better reached by free trade in ideas—that the best test of truth is the power of the thought to get itself accepted in the competition of the market, and that truth is the only ground upon which their wishes safely can be carried out. That, at any rate, is the theory of our Constitution. It is an experiment, as all life is an experiment. Every year if not every day we have to wager our salvation upon some prophecy based upon imperfect knowledge. While that experiment is part of our system I think that we should be eternally vigilant against attempts to check the expression of opinions that we loathe and believe to be fraught with death, unless they so imminently threaten immediate interference with the lawful and pressing purposes of the law that an immediate check is required to save the country.

I wholly disagree with the argument of the Government that the first amendment left the common law as to seditious libel in force. History seems to me against the notion. I had conceived that the United States through many years had shown its repentance for the Sedition Act of 1798 by repaying fines that it imposed. Only the emergency that makes it immediately dangerous to leave the correction of evil counsels to time warrants making any exception to the sweeping command, "Congress shall make no law * * * abridging the freedom of speech." Of course, I am speaking only of expressions of opinion and exhortations, which were all that were uttered here, but I regret that I cannot put into more impressive words my belief that in their conviction upon this indictment the defendants were deprived of their rights under the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Mr. President, in the Schwimmer case citizenship was denied in the United States District Court to a woman applicant for naturalization, about 50 years of age, who said she would not agree to take up arms for this country. The district court refused naturalization. The circuit court of appeals considered her statement immaterial because women are considered incapable of bearing arms. A majority of the Justices of the United States Supreme Court were of the opinion that Mrs. Schwimmer lacked, in Mr. Justice Butler's words, "that attachment to the principles of the Constitution of which the applicant is required to give affirmative evidence by the Naturalization Act." Mr. Justice Holmes and Mr. Justice Brandeis dissented, and, in the course of the dissenting opinion, Mr. Justice Holmes made some statements which I ask to have incorporated in the RECORD.

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

The applicant seems to be a woman of superior character and intelligence, obviously more than ordinarily desirable as a citizen of the United States. It is agreed that she is qualified for citizenship except so far as the views set forth in a statement of facts "may show that the applicant is not attached to the principles of the Constitution of the United States and well disposed to the good order and happiness of the same, and except insofar as the same may show that she cannot take the oath of allegiance without a mental reservation."

The views referred to are an extreme opinion in favor of pacifism and a statement that she would not bear arms to defend the Constitution. So far as the adequacy of her oath is concerned I hardly can see how it is affected by the statement, inasmuch as she is a woman over 50 years of age, and would not be allowed to bear arms if she wanted to. And as to the opinion, the whole examination of the applicant shows that she holds none of the now-dreaded creeds but thoroughly believes in organized government and prefers that of the United States to any other in the world.

Surely it cannot show lack of attachment to the principles of the Constitution that she thinks it can be improved. I suppose

that most intelligent people think that it might be. Her particular improvement looking to the abolition of war seems to me not materially different in its bearing on this case from a wish to establish cabinet government as in England, or a singe house, or one term of 7 years for the President. To touch a more burning question, only a judge mad with partisanship would exclude because the applicant thought that the eighteenth amendment should be repealed.

Of course, the fear is that if a war came the applicant would exert activities such as were dealt with in *Schenck* v. *United States* (see p. 231). But that seems to me unfounded. Her position and motives are wholly different from those of Schenck. She is an optimist and states in strong and, I do not doubt, sincere words her belief that war will disappear and that the impending destiny of mankind is to unite in peaceful leagues.

I do not share that optimism nor do I think that a philosophic view of the world would regard war as absurd. But most people who have known it regard it with horror, as a last resort, and even if not yet ready for cosmopolitan efforts, would welcome any practicable combinations that would increase the power on the side of peace.

The notion that the applicant's optimistic anticipations would make her a worse citizen is sufficiently answered by her examination, which seems to me a better argument for her admission than any I can offer. Some of her answers might excite popular prejudice, but if there is any principle of the Constitution that more imperatively calls for attachment than any other it is the principle of free thought—not free thought for those who agree with us but freedom for the thought that we hate. I think that we should adhere to that principle with regard to admission into, as well as to life within this country.

And recurring to the opinion that bars this applicant's way, I would suggest that the Quakers have done their share to make the country what it is, that many citizens agree with the applicant's belief and that I had not supposed hitherto that we regretted our inability to expel them because they believe more than some of us do in the teachings of the Sermon on the Mount.

THE CLASSIFIED CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, there has been a great deal of discussion recently relative to the extension of the classified civil service to include the emergency organizations, where appointments now may be made without regard to the civil-service rules and regulations. I am one of those who believe that our public service should represent the highest degree of ability to be found anywhere. It should set an example for efficiency to our commercial and industrial life, and lead, rather than trail, private industry.

That great Democratic President, Grover Cleveland, who said, "A public office is a public trust", did more to advance the merit system than anyone else since the approval of the Civil Service Act on January 16, 1883. The patriot and statesman, Col. Theodore Roosevelt, another champion of the merit system, served as Civil Service Commissioner under Mr. Cleveland; and when Colonel Roosevelt became President, following the example of Grover Cleveland, he further enlarged and extended the classified service. Grover Cleveland and Theodore Roosevelt were our two greatest advocates of taking the public service out of the realm of partisan politics.

I do not believe there is a single Member of the Senate who believes in trying to fill a round hole with a square plug in the public service; and I am convinced, after giving the matter considerable thought, that the present administration is adhering to very high standards in filling positions in the branches of the service excepted from the civil-service rules and regulations—in some instances higher than those required by the Civil Service Commission itself.

In our zeal to improve the Federal service I think we should be careful not to go too far, and should constantly bear in mind that policy-forming positions should be open and free for appointment, so that the appointing power may appoint to such positions individuals who are responsive to the will of the people as expressed at the polls. Good government must always permit the changing of policy-forming officials whenever the people desire a change of administration.

I am not one of those who believe that a man is any less efficient because he happens to be recommended by one of the chosen Representatives of the people; nor do I believe that because a man is in the classified service he should become a mere machine, and be afraid to express his honest convictions on controversial or public questions. We are attempting to get a high type of personnel in the Government service; and if we succeed, as I believe we are succeeding, we shall have in the public service people who are much above the average degree of intelligence. Rather than hide their light under a basket, I would absolutely require that employees in the public service with voting residence in one of the States exercise the right of suffrage as a condition to their continuance in office; and if they have a superior knowledge of government, as they should have, they are persons who should, above all others, express at the polls their preference based on their knowledge of government.

Webster tells us that politics is the science and art of government. I think every intelligent citizen should be proud of being a student of the science of government, and should exercise the right of suffrage. We should always remember that under any system the price of good government is eternal vigilance.

As a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, my greatest interest is centered around the Department of Agriculture, which is endeavoring so nobly to uplift the American farmer. In this critical period of our Nation's history I believe we are, indeed, fortunate in having at the head of that great Department a very able man, and, doubtless, the most constructive Secretary who has ever presided over the Department of Agriculture since the establishment of the office of Secretary of Agriculture in 1889, during the closing days of the first Cleveland administration. I have been in sufficiently close touch with the policies and high purposes of that Department to know the type of individuals being appointed in the Department of Agriculture to positions excepted from civil-service examination. It has been impressed upon me repeatedly that anyone appointed to a position in the Department must have every qualification necessary for the position sought, "and then some." In the Department the theory is being practiced that the greater includes the lesser, and that it is better to have a man who is bigger than the job than a man who is not quite big enough.

While I favor a true merit system, with full authority vested in the appointive power to appoint policy-making officers at will, I believe in giving every man his just dues, and I will not belittle anyone simply because he happens to hold a Government position outside of the realm of the classified civil service.

In the Department of Agriculture not only is efficiency the primary consideration precedent to appointment, but the law of apportionment requiring that appointment to positions at the seat of Government be apportioned among the several States and the District of Columbia on the basis of population is enforced, as well as section 9 of the Civil Service Act, which bars appointment of more than two persons in one family, and section 213 of the Economy Act, relative to husband and wife being in the service at one and the same time.

In order that the Senate and the country may know the type of persons who are being appointed to positions outside the classified civil service in the branch of the Department of Agriculture where appointments may be made without regard to the civil-service law—the Agricultural Adjustment Administration—I recently requested that I be furnished with a list of the individuals appointed to positions excepted from examination, together with a statement of their education. I hold in my hand, Mr. President, a list of individuals appointed in the Agricultural Adjustment Administration to positions excepted from examination, at salaries ranging from $840 to $2,600 per annum, inclusive, showing the name of the appointee, the State or District to which accredited, the designation of the position, the salary, the degree obtained, as well as the colleges which conferred the degrees; and I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

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

The list is as follows:

List of individuals appointed in the Agricultural Adjustment Administration

Name of employee	Legal residence	College or university from which graduated	Degrees attained
		$840 class	
Power, William A	Missouri	Alabama Polytechnic Institute	B. S. (mechanical engineering).
		$1,080 class	
Campbell, Thomas J	New Jersey	Catholic University of America	B. A.
Freund, John L	District ofColumbia	Georgetown University	B. A.
McLaughlin, Merrill M	Colorado	University of Colorado	B. A.
		$1,260 class	
Adams, Edward L	Minnesota	University of Minnesota	B. A.
Adams, Forest John	Missouri	Kansas State College	B. A.
Argel, Manuel A	Illinois	National University	B. A.
Baca, Antonio R	New Mexico	University of New Mexico	B. A. (political science and languages).
Barger, Joseph D	North Carolina	Elon College	B. A.
Barnes, Pauline	do	Meredith College, Raleigh	B. M.
Bernard, David M., Jr	Florida	Davidson College, Davidson, N. C	B. S. (economics).
Bieber, Harry	Nebraska	University of Nebraska	B. S.
Bittick, Ralph	Missouri	William Jewell College, Liberty, Mo	B. A. (chemistry and English).
Boyd, Jack H., III	North Carolina	University of North Carolina	B. S. (commerce).
Britzius, Harold A	Minnesota	University of Minnesota	B. A.
Bugen, Paul	Pennsylvania	Lafayette College	B. S.
Burch, L. O	Missouri	Central College, Fayette, Mo	B. A. (economics).
Carter, Hansel	South Carolina	Wofford College, Spartanburg	B. A.
Castles, Ira C., Jr	Louisiana	Louisiana State University	B. S.
Cherry, Elisabeth	Missouri	Lewis College, Glasgow, Mo	B. S.
Colter, Bertha M	Pennsylvania	Wilson College, Chambersburg	B. S.
Covington, Mabel L	Texas	Baylor University, Waco	B. A.
Croom, Arthur B	North Carolina	North Carolina State College	B. S. (chemistry).
Daniel, R. L	Kentucky	Owensboro College	B. L.
Davis, Edward T	Oklahoma	Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College	B. S. (agriculture).
Davis, Orpha	Idaho	Utah State Agricultural College	B. S. (science and commerce).
Dillman, Virginia-Lee	South Dakota	George Washington University	A. B. (foreign service).
Dreiling, Edwin J	Kansas	Fort Hays State College	B. A.
Duncan, William H	Missouri	Rockhurst College, Kansas City	B. S. (premedical).
English, Logan B	Kentucky	Centre College, Danville South Baptist Theological Seminary	B. A., M. A. Th. M.
English, William E	Missouri	Westminster College, Fulton	B. A.
Figeac, Louis E	California	St. Mary's College, California	B. A.
Flaherty, Thomas F	Massachusetts	Boston College	B. A.
Flaig, Annielouise	Minnesota	American University	B. A.
Friend, Carter W	Virginia	Hampden-Sydney College	B. S. (mathematics).
Girsch, Howard J	Iowa	Columbia College, Dubuque	B. A.
Gobrecht, Hilda B	Pennsylvania	Garfield M. Hospital	R. N.
Golladay, Virginia J	Tennessee	Cumberland University	B. A.
Gouse, Constance Y	Maine	Colby College, Waterville	B. A.
Gudenkauf, Pete L	Missouri	Rockhurst College, Kansas City	B. S. (chemistry).
Gunning, Ray A	Colorado	University of Colorado	LL. B.
Hancock, Wilbur C	Nebraska	Fremont College, Fremont	B. S. C.
Harllee, Harry T	South Carolina	Clemson College	B. S. (agricultural engineering).
Harrington, Richard G	Kentucky	Shelbyville College	B. S.
Hartsfield, Augustus M	Georgia	University of Georgia Georgetown Law School	B. A. LL. B.
Holman, Raymond G	Missouri	University of Missouri Moberly (Mo.) Junior College	B. J. A. A.
Hume, C. M	Tennessee	University of Tennessee	B. S. (agriculture).
Hunt, Ray M	Kentucky	University of Kentucky	B. S. (commerce).
Jamison, Edith V	Arkansas	University of Arkansas	B. A.
Kelley, Oscar L	Georgia	Emory University, Atlanta	B. A. (biology and chemistry).
Kemper, Anne M	Minnesota	Northwestern Hospital Training School	R. N.
Kent, Ramon L	Washington	Washington State College	B. S. (agriculture).
Kindoll, Clarence M	Kentucky	University of Kentucky	B. S. (agriculture).
Lane, Edward Rudolph	North Carolina	Washington and Lee University	B. S. (business administration).
Lapidus, Milton	Texas	University of Texas	B. S. (electrical engineering).
Larin, Lenore	North Dakota	University of North Dakota	B. S.
Leach, Clayton B	Missouri	Park College, Parkville	B. A.
Leecraft, Donald S	Oklahoma	Southeastern Teachers' College	B. A.
Lester, William G., Jr	Virginia	King College, Bristol, Tenn	B. A.
Lyle, Gordon R	Tennessee	Maryville College	B. A.
Maloney, John J	Missouri	Rockhurst College, Kansas City	B. S.
Marshall, Benjamin W	Virginia	Hampden-Sydney College	B. S. (mathematics and chemistry).
Meeks, Bernard M	Georgia	University of Georgia	B. S. (commerce).
Metz, Jack G	Arizona	St. Mary's College, California	B. A.
Michael, Robert S	Kentucky	Ohio State University	B. A.
Minshew, Will R	North Carolina	Duke University	B. A.
McDonald, Fred	Arkansas	Arkansas College	B. A.
McNeill, Paul J	Pennsylvania	Georgetown University	B. A.
Neumann, Mrs. Dorothy R	South Dakota	Mount Holyoke College, South Hadley, Mass	B. A.
Nichols, Gladys	Indiana	Indiana University Training School for Nurses	R. N.
O'Neill, John J., Jr	Massachusetts	Villanova College, Pennsylvania	B. A.
Parker, Bernadine G	South Carolina	Syracuse University	B. A.
Parrill, Mildred A	West Virginia	Pennsylvania College for Women	B. A.
Pate, George D	Alabama	Birmingham-Southern College	B. A. (economics).
Pearson, G. D	North Carolina	University of North Carolina	B. A.
Powers, William T	Virginia	Randolph-Macon College	B. S.
Purrington, Sara G	North Carolina	University of North Carolina	B. A.
Putnam, Velma	Missouri	University of Kansas	B. S. (business administration).
Rapier, James L., Jr	Kentucky	University of Dayton, Ohio	B. S. (commerce).
Reedy, Marie E	Kansas	Kansas State Teachers College	B. S.
Reid, Alice	Missouri	Park College, Parkville Colorado Teachers College	L. B. B. A.
Renfrow, William F	North Carolina	University of North Carolina	B. A.
Rogers, Leslie L., Jr	South Carolina	The Citadel, Charleston	B. S. (physics).
Rudolph, Robert L	Kentucky	University of Kentucky	B. S. (agriculture).
Schindler, Mary W	Minnesota	College of St. Catherine, St. Paul	B. A.
Schoepflin, Wilma	Kansas	University of Kansas	B. A.
Scholl, Oscar A	Missouri	Pubicam Business College, St. Louis	B. C. S.
Shepard, Hazel	Pennsylvania	Ohio State University	B. A., M. A.
Shipp, Warren E	Utah	Brigham Young University, Provo	B. S. (agriculture and chemistry).
Sinquefield, James R	Florida	University of Florida	B. S., B. A. (business administration).
Smith, Alice P	Oregon	North Dakota State College	B. S.
Smith, John William	North Carolina	North Carolina State College	B. S. (electrical engineering).
Smith, Solace Adelaide	New York	Russell Sage College, Troy	B. S.

List of individuals appointed in the Agricultural Adjustment Administration—Continued

Name of employee	Legal residence	College or university from which graduated	Degrees attained
		$1,260 class—Continued	
Smithwick, W. V	Georgia	George Washington University	B. A.
		University of Florida	J. D.
Spence, Dorothy	do	Peabody College, Nashville, Tenn	B. S.
		University of Illinois	B. S. (library science).
Stinson, Flora Mary	Tennessee	University of Tennessee	B. A.
Stoll, Norman A	Wisconsin	University of Wisconsin	Ph. B. (economic law).
Thompson, John L	Massachusetts	Vermont University	B. S. (commerce and economics).
Tilton, Bert A	Iowa	University of Iowa	B. A., LL. D.
Townsend, James B	Missouri	St. Louis University	LL. B.
Twomey, Grace M	California	San Francisco State College	B. A.
Waller, R. H	Kentucky	Georgetown College, Kentucky	B. A.
Warner, Marjorie M	Oregon	University of Oregon	B. A
Watts, J. C., Jr	Arkansas	Elon College	B. A.
Wells, Henry N., Jr	Mississippi	Mississippi State College	B. S.
Wells, Virginia Rose	Kentucky	Ohio State University	B. S.
Wheeler, Virginia	Nebraska	Hastings College, Hastings	B. A. (public-school music).
Wiegers, Cecelia D	Missouri	University of Missouri	B. A.
Wiesner, Fred L	Kansas	Creighton College of Commerce, Omaha	B. S. C.
York, Harold C	Maine	National University Law School	LL. B.
		$1,440 class	
Abrams, Marian F	Ohio	Benjamin Franklin University	B. C. S. (accountancy).
Adams, Louis McGill	Delaware	University of Delaware	B. A.
Adams, Stanley T. F	Nebraska	University of California	B. A.
Addams, Harvey J	Kansas	Kansas University	B. A. (business administration).
Ames, C. Carlisle	Kentucky	University of Kentucky	B. S.
Amis, Edward S	do	do	B. S., M. S.
Anderson, Dora Mae	Arkansas	University of Arkansas	B. S. (home economics).
Anderson, Mary E	Mississippi	Mississippi Women's College	B. A. (biology).
Anselmo, Amerigo P	Connecticut	Georgetown University	Ph. B.
		Georgetown Law School	LL. B.
Armbruster, Frances	Nevada	University of Nevada	B. A.
Atkinson, Reilly, Jr	Idaho	University of Washington	B. A.
Austin, Rosalie H	New York	St. Lawrence University, Canton	B. A.
Austin, Willis H	Wisconsin	University of Wisconsin	B. A.
Avera, Nicholas	New Jersey	North Carolina State College	B. A. (accountancy).
Ayers, Willard C	West Virginia	University of West Virginia	B. A.
		National University Law School	J. D.
Bannister, William K	Ohio	University of Chicago	Ph. B.
Barlow, Thurston N	Texas	University of Texas	B. A. (government and economics).
Barry, John P	Massachusetts	Boston College	B. A.
		Catholic University	M. A. (history).
Bean, Fellmer B	Kentucky	University of Kentucky	B. S.
Beaumont, Edmund W	Maine	Bowdoin College, Brunswick	B. A.
Bell, Walter R	Nevada	University of Nevada	B. S.
Bernard, Mrs. Ruth M	Oklahoma	University of Oklahoma	B. A.
Binder, Sidney	New York	College of the City of New York	B. A.
Bishop, Clair R	Nebraska	University of Nebraska	B. A.
Black, Pitzer D	Kentucky	Centre College, Danville	B. A.
Block, Raphael H	Arkansas	University of Chicago	Ph. B.
Bolkovatz, Walter H	Montana	Georgetown Foreign Service	B. F. S.
		Georgetown Law School	LL. B.
Boring, Merle	Georgia	Piedmont College, Demorest	B. A.
Bowman, Mrs. Irene S	Colorado	Colorado College	B. A.
Boyles, Robert	Missouri	Park College, Parkville	B. A.
Boyles, William A	West Virginia	University of Maryland	B. S., M. S.
Braunstein, Ira T	New York	Royal University, Lemberg, Austria	LL. D.
		New York University	M. A.
Bray, Harriet E	Texas	Hollins College, Hollins, Va	B. A.
		University of Maryland	M. S.
Brett, Eloise	Tennessee	Southwestern College, Memphis	B. A.
Briggson, Fred O	Wisconsin	University of Wisconsin	B. S. (dairying).
		University of Missouri	M. A. (dairying).
Brinkmann, George L	Missouri	do	B. A., B. J.
Brown, Paul Jean	Illinois	Southern Illinois State Normal University	B. A.
Brown, Robert L	Missouri	University of Missouri	B. A.
Bryant, Gretchen C	Ohio	Ohio University	B. S.
Buch, Richard P	Missouri	Harvard University	B. A.
Buchtel, William	Colorado	University of Denver	B. A.
Buffum, Fenwick N	New York	Middlebury College, Vermont	B. S.
Burton, Wilson E	Minnesota	State Teachers' College	B. E.
Callender, Howard C	do	Catholic University of America	LL. B.
Campbell, Frank G	Missouri	University of Missouri	B. S.
Campbell, Ralph	Arkansas	College of the Ozarks, Clarksville	B. S. (biology and chemistry).
Canning, Thomas J	Massachusetts	Georgetown Law School	LL. B.
Carew, Richard J	Pennsylvania	University of Pennsylvania	B. S.
Carpenter, Mrs. Elizabeth B	Alabama	Mary Baldwin Seminary, Staunton, Va	B. M. (music).
Carrigan, William A	Arkansas	Duke University	B. A.
Carson, Milton R	Pennsylvania	University of Pittsburgh	B. S., M. A.
Carter, Joseph A	Missouri	George Washington University	B. S. (physical education).
Castiello, Joseph F	Pennsylvania	Albright College, Reading	B. A.
		Catholic University	LL. B.
Causey, Anne M	Florida	Smith College	B. A.
Cheney, George P., Jr	Connecticut	Holy Cross College	B. A.
Childers, Dorothy N	Missouri	University of Missouri	B. A., B. J.
Christianson, Carl G	Indiana	Notre Dame University	B. A. (journalism and advertising).
Clark, Floyd M	Texas	Simmons University, Abilene	B. A.
Clark, Mrs. Lura S	Mississippi	Waverly Institute, Byhalia	B. A.
Clay, Edna L	Alabama	Tulane University, New Orleans, La	B. A., B. S.
Cleary, William H	Minnesota	Notre Dame University	B. A.
Clift, Charles H	Oklahoma	Oklahoma University	B. A.
Clifton, Robert J	Indiana	University of Pennsylvania	B. S. (economics).
Cole, Erma E	Iowa	Upper Iowa University	B. A.
		Yale University	Ph. D.
Connolly, Frank	Indiana	Notre Dame University	B. A.
Cowan, Mrs. Margaret	Arkansas	Galloway College, Searcy	B. A.
Cowser, Charlotte E	Illinois	Northwestern University	B. S.
Crawford, Donald R	West Virginia	University of Washington	B. S., M. S.
Crawford, Robert L	Utah	University of Utah	B. A.
Cureton, West M	California	University of California	B. A.
Currie, Daniel A	North Carolina	Davidson College, Davidson	B. S.
Dailey, Walter S	Arkansas	University of Arkansas	B. A., B. S.
Daly, Edward F	Wyoming	Columbus University	B. C. S. (accountancy).
Davis, Dorothy O'Neal	Louisiana	Randolph-Macon Women's College, Virginia	B. A.

List of individuals appointed in the Agricultural Adjustment Administration—Continued

Name of employee	Legal residence	College or university from which graduated	Degrees attained
		$1,440 class—Continued	
Davis, Olga M	Massachusetts	Simmons College, Boston	B. S. (secretarial).
Dean, Helen E	Washington	University of Washington	B. A.
Donavan, Robert P	Illinois	Columbia College, Dubuque, Iowa	B. A.
Donoho, Donovan H	Florida	Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn	B. A.
		LaSalle Extension University, Philadelphia	LL. B.
Duffy, William F	New York	University of Notre Dame	Ph. B. (commerce).
		Harvard University	M. B. A.
Duggan, Helen	Connecticut	Smith College, Northampton, Mass	B. A. (history and government).
		Columbia University	M. A. (history).
Duscha, Harry J	Minnesota	Catholic University of America	LL. B.
Dwyer, Rita I	Massachusetts	Marywood College, Scranton, Pa	B. A.
Dye, James G	Kentucky	University of Kentucky	B. S. (agriculture).
Earle, Samuel B., Jr	South Carolina	Clemson College	B. S. (architecture).
		Cornell University	M. S. (architecture).
Edens, Baxter C	do	University of South Carolina	B. S. (economics and accounting).
Elder, Walter E	Kansas	University of Kansas	B. A.
Ellis, Robert B	Illinois	University of Missouri	B. A.
Engelking, Helen C	Texas	University of Texas	B. A.
Everhart, Herbert W	West Virginia	West Virginia University	B. S. (agriculture).
		Shepherd College	B. A. (social and biological sciences).
Falabella, Joseph F	Pennsylvania	Temple University, Philadelphia	B. S. C.
Faulkner, Sallie E	South Carolina	Winthrop College, Rock Hill	B. S. (business administration).
Fenton, Richard H	Connecticut	Connecticut State College	B. S.
Figert, Frederick M	Iowa	Morningside College, Sioux City	B. A.
Finn, Thomas B., Jr	Colorado	Catholic University of America	B. A., LL. B.
Flanagan, W. Donald	Wisconsin	Oshkosh State Teachers' College	B. E.
Floyd, Ruth	Georgia	Elon College	B. A.
Foster, John B., Jr	Illinois	Washington University, St. Louis, Mo	B.A., B. S.
Foster, Robert M	Michigan	University of Michigan	B. A. (journalism).
Fowler, Thelma May	Kansas	State Teachers' College	B. S.
Fox, Nannie	Alabama	Women's College	B. A.
		George Washington University	M. A.
Fox, Richard K	Wyoming	University of Montana	B. A. (business administration).
Francavilla, Joseph P	Connecticut	Fordham University	B. S.
Freeman, John F	Kentucky	University of Kentucky	B. S. (commerce).
Fried, Lillian	California	San Diego State College	B. A.
Frost, Ruth M	North Dakota	North Dakota State College	B. S. (home economics).
Fulks, Frances B	New York	Greenville College, Illinois	B. A.
Furrey, Verna Frances	District of Columbia	Trinity College	B. A.
Garretson, Mary L	Georgia	Agnes Scott College, Decatur	B. A.
Gaukel, Maxine	South Dakota	South Dakota State College	B. S.
Geer, James M	Nebraska	Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill	B. S. (commerce).
Geier, Benjamin G	Wisconsin	University of Wisconsin	B. A.
Getz, Howard	Pennsylvania	Syracuse University	B. S. (business).
Giles, Mrs. Elizabeth D	Oklahoma	University of Oklahoma	B. A.
Gilmer, Jesse B	New Mexico	New Mexico State College	B. S. (civil engineering).
Given, J. B	South Carolina	Biltmore School of Forestry	B. F.
Gleason, William J	New York	Canisius College, Buffalo	B. S.
Gledhill, Albert H	Connecticut	Connecticut State College	B. S. (economics).
Goldberg, Abraham	Pennsylvania	Lehigh University	B. A.
Gordon, Benjamin E	Massachusetts	Boston University	B. A.
		Harvard Law School	LL. B.
Gordon, Emanuel	New Jersey	Dickinson School of Law, Carlisle, Pa	LL. B.
Goshorn, Walter S	Ohio	College of Wooster	B. A. (mathematics).
Grady, Edmund J	North Dakota	University of North Dakota	B. C. S. (commerce).
Gray, Wayne T	Kentucky	University of Nebraska	B. S. (agriculture).
		University of Wisconsin	M. A., Ph. D.
Green, Mrs. Dorothy F	Mississippi	Mississippi State College for Women	B. S.
Green, Martha K	Ohio	Miami University, Oxford	B. S. (education).
Gross, Philip	Minnesota	Catholic University	B. S.
Guiler, William P	New York	St. Vincent College, Latrobe, Pa	B. A.
Gurley, Marie	Missouri	University of Missouri	B. A.
		George Washington University	M. A.
Hall, Chadwick O	South Dakota	Sioux Falls College	B. A.
Hall, Joseph P	West Virginia	Wesleyan University	B. S.
Halpin, James D	Missouri	St. Aloysius, Kansas City	B. A.
		St. Benedict's College, Atchison, Kans	B. S. (premedical).
Halverson, Earl F	Wisconsin	University of Wisconsin	B. A.
Hammons, Clinton B	Kentucky	Union College, Barbourville	B. S.
Hannon, Anthony R	Ohio	St. John's University, Toledo	B. A.
		St. Mary's University, Cincinnati	M. A.
Hargrave, Fearman W	Michigan	University of Michigan	B. A., M. B. A.
Harmon, Joseph L	Missouri	University of Missouri	B. A. (economics).
Harris, Mary L	Mississippi	Mississippi State College for Women	B. A.
Harvey, Donald R	Nebraska	University of Nebraska	B. S. (education).
Hendricks, Lewis E	South Carolina	Clemson College	B. S. (agricultural economics).
Hermida, Thomas J	New Jersey	Newark Tech	B. S. (civil engineering).
Hickey, John H	do	Catholic University	B. E. E.
Hickman, Thorval L	Utah	Utah State Agricultural College	B. S.
Hicks, Mabel A	New York	University of Rochester	B. S.
Hodge, Frank D	Utah	University of Utah	B. A. (biology).
Hogue, Mrs. Mary P	Kansas	University of Kansas	B. A.
Holloman, Will White	Tennessee	Southwestern College, Memphis	B. S.
Hookom, Don W	Iowa	Iowa Wesleyan College	B. S.
		University of Maryland	M. S.
Hope, Mildred C	Pennsylvania	Columbus University	LL. B.
Howard, Robert F	California	University of California	B. A. (political science).
Hranac, M. Edith	Nebraska	University of Nebraska	B. S.
Hughes, Edgar E., Jr	Arkansas	Hendrix College, Conway	B. A.
Hurley, Charles	New Hampshire	Holy Cross College	Ph. D.
		Georgetown University	LL. B.
James, Robert M	Ohio	Bowling Green State College	B. S.
Jeter, Madeleine	Arkansas	Hendrix College, Conway	B. A.
		George Peabody College, Nashville, Tenn	M. A.
John, Henrie E	California	University of Southern California	B. A. (commerce and political science)
Johnson, Sara Strother	North Carolina	East Carolina Teachers' College	B. A. (science and home economics).
Johnston, Helen E	Illinois	University of Illinois	B. A.
Jones, Daniel O	Idaho	Utah State Agricultural College	B. S.
Junkin, George	Texas	Washington and Lee University	B. A.
Kelley, Mrs. Will N	South Carolina	Converse College, Spartanburg	B. A. (mathematics).
Kelsey, William E	Indiana	Oakland City College	B. A.
Kennedy, Esther M	Oklahoma	Oklahoma College for Women	B. S. (commerce).
Kent, Mary L	Pennsylvania	Goucher College, Baltimore, Md	B. A.
Killgore, John P	Colorado	University of Colorado	L. B.

List of individuals appointed in the Agricultural Adjustment Administration—Continued

Name of employee	Legal residence	College or university from which graduated	Degrees attained
		$1,440 class—Continued	
King, Russell J	Minnesota	University of Minnesota	B. B. A.
Knight, Helen M	Nebraska	State University of Nebraska	B. F. A.
Koch, Robert W	Illinois	University of Illinois	B. S.
Kopecky, John W	Texas	Spring Hill College, Ala	B. A.
Krixtein, Simon	Massachusetts	Harvard College Harvard Graduate School of Arts and Sciences	B. A. (history, government, and economics).
Lalle, Anthony W	New York	Canisius College, Buffalo	Ph. B.
Lamb, Charles F	Missouri	Southeastern State Teachers' College	B. A.
Lancaster, Lula Mae	North Carolina	Flora McDonald College, Red Springs	B. A.
Larson, Morris	North Dakota	George Washington University	B. A. (economics and commerce).
Larson, Vincent V	Utah	State Agricultural College	B. S.
Law, John H	Pennsylvania	St. Thomas College, Scranton Georgetown University	B. A. LL. B.
Law, Raymond T	do	St. Thomas College, Scranton Georgetown University	B. A. LL. B.
Leap, James B	do	St. Francis College, Loretto	B. S.
Lehman, John W	Wisconsin	University of Wisconsin	B. A., M. A. (economics).
Leonard, Frederick S	Iowa	Columbia College, Dubuque	B. A.
Lister, Joseph J	New Jersey	Niagara University, Niagara Falls Columbia University	B. A. (economics). M. A. (sociology).
Lively, Carl B	West Virginia	Washington State College	B. S. (forestry and botany).
MacMillan, J. Rankin	Ohio	Muskingum College, New Concord	B. A. (business administration).
MacNutt, Leta	Florida	Florida State College for Women	B. A.
Maher, Laurence F	New Mexico	University of Notre Dame	B. A. (commerce).
Maley, Austin P	Pennsylvania	College of the Holy Cross	B. A.
Malone, Richard S	Ohio	Oberlin College	B. A.
Mannix, Charles J., Jr	Indiana	Notre Dame University	B. A.
Marcoux, Roger W	Maine	Duke University	B. A.
Mark, Albin O	North Dakota	Macalester College, St. Paul, Minn	B. A. (economics).
Mark, Roland P	do	University of North Dakota	B. S. C. (commerce and journalism).
Martin, Margaret Bell	Kansas	Washburn College, Topeka	B. M.
Martin, Virginia C	Pennsylvania	William Woods College for Girls	B. A., B. D. S.
McCarron, George C	Ohio	Mount St. Joseph College, Baltimore, Md	M. A.
McCarthy, Timothy W	Connecticut	Catholic Univeristy of America	B. A.
McCreary, Robert M	Colorado	University of Colorado	B. A. (economics).
McCrite, Lucille W	Washington	State College of Washington	B. A.
McDonald, Mrs. Dorothy R	Texas	Randolph College, Cisco	B. A.
McKinnon, Mrs. Edna R	Montana	University of Montana	B. A., LL. B.
McKone, Michael	Ohio	London University, London, England	B. A.
McLoughlin, Thomas F	Connecticut	Worcester Polytechnic Institute	B. S.
McLucas, John D	Colorado	University of Colorado	B. A.
McMillan, Donald M	California	San Francisco Law School	LL. B.
Meade, Thomas A	Connecticut	Harvard University	B. S. (economics).
Melville, Elmer O	Missouri	Kansas City School of Law Columbus University	LL. B. LL. M
Miller, Thomas H	West Virginia	National University	LL. B.
Miller, Virginia E	Florida	Florida State College	B. A. (French and sociology).
Milroy, Charles K	Oklahoma	Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College	B. S.
Mitchell, Burl K	Illinois	Eastern Illinois Teachers' College	B. E.
Mittelman, Albert	New York	College of the City of New York	B. S. S.
Moore, M. Lucile	North Carolina	North Carolina College for Women	B. A.
Moran, Dorothy J	Georgia	University of Georgia Middlebury College, Vermont	B. A. M. A.
Morris, Katharine	Maryland	Swarthmore College	B. A.
Mortensen, N. Arthur	Utah	University of Washington	B. A.
Moss, Phyllis H	do	University of Utah	B. A.
Mulliner, Louise	do	University of Idaho	B. A. (business).
Munson, Sam C	Mississippi	Mississippi State College	B. S. (general science). M. S. (biology).
Murphy, Mildred L	Puerto Rico	Maryland College for Women	B. A.
Murphy, Thomas Anthony	Connecticut	Catholic University	B. A.
Murray, Budd M	Colorado	Colorado Agricultural College	B. A. (agriculture).
Murray, Regina M	New York	Georgian Court College, Lakewood, N. J	B. A., M. A.
Myers, Jefferson H	Minnesota	University of Minnesota	B. S.
Nance, Edna Mae	Arkansas	Stephen's College, Hoboken, N. J University of Missouri	A. A. LL. B.
Nealon, Miriam D	Pennsylvania	Simmons College, Boston, Mass	B. S.
Needham, Maurice d'Arlan	Arkansas	University of Iowa	B. A.
Nelson, Ealton L	Iowa	University of Missouri	B. J.
Nichols, Edward J	California	Gonzaga University, Spokane, Wash	B. A.
Niland, Edward M	Pennsylvania	Marquette University, Wisconsin	B. E. E.
Noble, William R	Kansas	University of Kansas	B. A.
Notte, Dominic	Oklahoma	Georgetown University	B. S.
O'Brien, Charles H	Maine	do	B. F. S.
O'Connell, Francis J	Massachusetts	Catholic University	B. A.
O'Connell, William L	do	Holy Cross College	B. A.
Olman, Marjorie D	Wisconsin	University of Wisconsin	B. S.
O'Loughlin, James M	Massachusetts	College of the Holy Cross	B. S.
O'Reilly, John E	New York	University of Rochester St. John's University Law School	B. A. LL. B.
Orlandi, José D	Puerto Rico	Pennsylvania State College	B. S.
Orlando, Pompei L	Pennsylvania	Muhlenberg College, Allentown	A. B., Ph. B.
Osborne, Annette M	North Carolina	North Carolina College for Women University of North Carolina	B. A. M. A.
Owen, Margarite	South Carolina	Winthrop College, Rock Hill	B. S. (business administration).
Palmer, Herbert M	Oklahoma	Central Teachers' College Oklahoma City University	B. S. B. A.
Paradine, Richard V	Pennsylvania	Williams College, Williamstown	B. A. (political science).
Parker, Ruth Elizabeth	Ohio	Ohio State University Catholic University	B. S. (physical education). M. S. (biology).
Parks, Mary Louise	District of Columbia	George Washington University	B. A. (finance).
Payne, Patricia A	Nebraska	Maternity Hospital Training School	R. N.
Peake, Redge	South Carolina	George Peabody University Lander College, Greenwood	B. S. (physical education). B. A.
Penn, Mary	Tennessee	Columbia University	B. A.
Perry, H. Judson	North Carolina	Acadia University Colgate University	B. A. B. D., M. A. (theological).
Phifer, Charles W	Ohio	Washington College of Law	LL. B., M. P. L.
Phillips, Tobias C	West Virginia	Washington and Lee University	B. A., LL. B.
Pittenger, Eugene L	Kansas	State Teachers' College	B. S. (education).
Polen, William J	Massachusetts	Suffolk Law School	LL. B.
Powell, Elizabeth	Alabama	Blue Mountain College, Mississippi	B. A.
Preheim, Arnold W	South Dakota	Yankton College, Yankton	B. A.
Prendergast, Robert M	Montana	Montana University	B. A.

List of individuals appointed in the Agricultural Adjustment Administration—Continued

Name of employee	Legal residence	College or university from which graduated	Degrees attained
		$1,440 class—continued	
Presti, Arthur A	Ohio	Hiram College, Hiram	B. A. (premedical).
Prichard, Elmer	Kentucky	Mississippi College	B. A.
		University of Richmond	M. A. (botany).
Pritchard, Arthur O., Jr	California	Pomona College, Claremont	B. A. (physical science).
		Columbia University	M. A. (public law).
Protas, Harry	District of Columbia	National University Law School	LL. B.
Puhl, June	Texas	University of Texas	B. S.
Purl, Virginia L	Oklahoma	Northeastern Teachers' College	B. A.
Randolph, Sandford F	West Virginia	Salem College, Salem	B. A., B. S.
Ray, Frank J	Tennessee	University of Tennessee	M. A., B. A.
Reed, Allen E	Ohio	Bethany College, Bethany, W. Va	B. A.
Reed, Reece	Arkansas	College of the Ozarks, Clarksville	B. A.
Rees, Maurice P	Colorado	Denver University School of Commerce and Finance	B. B. A.
Reese, Julia	Georgia	Georgia State College for Women	B. A.
		Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn	LL. B.
Regan, Joseph H	Connecticut	University of Notre Dame	B. C. S. (business administration).
Richman, William	Pennsylvania	Villanova College, Villanova	B. S. (premedical).
Riffel, Edward Riddick	Arkansas	Hendrix College, Conway	B. A. (economics).
Ringness, Ethel L	North Dakota	State Teachers' College	B. A.
Ritzen, David H	Minnesota	University of Minnesota	B. B. A.
Roddy, James H	Nebraska	University of Notre Dame	B. A.
Rogers, Arthur L	Mississippi	George Washington University	B. A. (economics).
Rogers, Jeptha S	Arkansas	University of Arkansas	B. A.
Rohlck, Mrs. Marie A	Minnesota	Iowa State College	B. S. (home economics and education
		Columbia University	M. S. (education).
Roman, Helen J	Missouri	S. W. Missouri State Teachers' College	B. S.
Romig, Mrs. Margaret S	West Virginia	Ohio University	B. S.
Ross, James C	Iowa	St. Ambrose College, Davenport	B. A.
		Georgetown Law School	LL. B.
Rostocil, Edward	Missouri	Kansas State College of Agriculture and Applied Science	B. S.
Rowe, Mrs. Irene K	Tennessee	State Teachers' College	B. S. (home economics and English).
Rubin, T. Gertrude	New Jersey	Barnard College, New York	B. A.
Russell, Francis S	Massachusetts	Boston College, Chestnut Hill	B. A.
Russell, Ted	Illinois	Iowa State College	B. S.
Sapp, Louis R	Ohio	Ohio State University	B. S. (business administration).
Schmidt, Thomas C	Wisconsin	University of Wisconsin	B. S. (agriculture).
Schubert, Wallace L	Minnesota	Augsburg College, Minneapolis	B. A. (history and political science).
Schumacher, Paul D	South Carolina	Clemson Agricultural and Mechanical College	B. S. (agricultural entomology).
Scott, Harold L	Arkansas	Arkansas University	B. S. (electrical engineering).
Seale, Rosa Lee	Kentucky	Bureau Academy	B. A.
		University of Kentucky	M. A.
Seeley, Reynolds W	New Mexico	New Mexico Normal University	B. S. (electrical and mechanical engineering).
Sellers, Jean	California	University of Southern California	B. A., M. A.
Selmecy, Steven	Michigan	Kalamazoo College	B. A.
Shannon, Kenneth J	North Dakota	University of North Dakota	B. S. (commerce).
Sheehan, William R	Massachusetts	Holy Cross College, Worcester	Ph. B.
Sheppard, Clara	South Carolina	Erskine College, Due West	B. A.
Shuman, Calvin W	Pennsylvania	Pennsylvania State College	B. S.
Simpson, Leonore	Missouri	Kansas City School of Law	LL. B., LL. M.
Slaughter, John J	Ohio	Ohio State University	B. S. (biology).
Smith, Chester Ronald	Utah	Utah State Agricultural College	B. S. (chemistry).
Smith, Kate Cooper	Arkansas	University of Arkansas	B. S. (business administration).
Sneed, William G	North Carolina	Iowa Christian College	B. A.
Sokoloski, Alexander J	Pennsylvania	Susquehanna University, Selinsgrove	B. A. (social science).
Sosna, Leon	Missouri	Washington University, St. Louis	B. S., B. A. (commerce and finance).
Sourwine, Mary N	Nevada	University of Nevada	B. A., M. A.
Sparks, Dade	Texas	East Texas Teachers' College	B. A. (history).
		University of Texas	M. A. (history).
		Duke University	Ph. D. (history).
Stanley, Berry W	Missouri	William Jewell College, Liberty	B. A.
Stanton, Elizabeth D	Louisiana	Whitworth College, Spokane, Wash	A. A.
		Birmingham Southern College	B. A.
Stanton, Katherine	Maryland	George Washington University	B. A.
Steger, Frank D	Ohio	Ohio Wesleyan, Delaware	B. A.
		Columbia University	M. A. (political economics).
Stepakof, Harry	Connecticut	George Washington University	B. A. (economics).
Stevens, Rita	New York	College of New Rochelle	B. S. (biology).
Stoney, Paul D	South Carolina	Clemson College, Clemson	B. S. (agriculture).
Straight, John H	California	University of California	B. A.
Sudnick, John F	Texas	National Law School	LL. B.
Summers, Walter A	Pennsylvania	University of Virginia	B. S. (economics).
Taylor, Esther M	Kansas	Teachers' College	B. S. (music).
Taylor, James O	Mississippi	University of Mississippi	B. A.
Terlizzi, Carmelo L	Pennsylvania	University of Pittsburgh	B. S.
Thomas, Reuben R	Arkansas	Arkansas Teachers' College	B. A. (history).
Tierney, John L	Mississippi	Loyola University of New Orleans	B. A.
Tiger, Lillian R	Missouri	Washington University, St. Louis	B. A.
Tipp, David F	Georgia	University of Pennsylvania	B. S. (economics).
Traxler, Frank A	Minnesota	University of Minnesota	B. S. (agricultural education)
Trent, Virginia Ann	Illinois	University of Illinois	B. S.
Turechek, Imogene E	Nebraska	Chadron State Normal College	B. S.
Turner, Arthur J	Missouri	Drury College, Springfield	B. A.
Vana, Gene M	Nebraska	Creighton University	B. S. (commerce).
Walch, Ralph A	Minnesota	University of Minnesota	B. A.
Walker, Walter S	Virginia	Virginia Polytechnic Institute	B. S. (civil engineering).
Waller, Henry, Jr	Oregon	Washington and Lee University	B. A.
Warner, Birk	West Virginia	West Virginia University	B. A.
Webb, Arch G	Utah	University of Utah	B. S.
Webb, Mrs. Phyllis	do	do	B. A.
Webster, George M	Kansas	University of Oklahoma	B. A.
		Harvard Business School	M. B. A.
Weinstein, Julian J	Florida	University of Florida	B. S.
		Harvard University	M. A. (biology).
Weisblut, Harold J	Missouri	Washington University, St. Louis	B. S.
Welborne, William Jackson	Arkansas	University of Arkansas	B. S.
West, Edward H. F	New York	Yale University	B. A.
Westbrook, Wilson E	Nevada	William and Mary College	B. A.
		Columbia University	M. A.
Wetmore, Waldo B	Kansas	Wichita University	B. A. (political science).
Whetsell, Floyd G	West Virginia	Davis Elkins College, Elkins	B. A.
Wieland, Joseph H	North Dakota	St. John's University, Collegeville, Minn	B. A.
		Georgetown University	M. S.
Williams, William E	North Carolina	Davidson College	B. A.
Willis, Doyle H	Texas	University of Texas	B. A., B. S.

List of individuals appointed in the Agricultural Adjustment Administration—Continued

Name of employee	Legal residence	College or university from which graduated	Degrees attained
		$1,440 class—Continued	
Windle, F. Jack	Kansas	University of Kansas	B. A.
Wise, Merrill S	Tennessee	Mississippi A. and M. College	B. S.
Witter, Raymond B	New Jersey	Alfred University, Alfred, N. Y	B. S. (ceramic engineering).
Wolfe, Beulah E	South Carolina	Berea College, Kentucky	B. A.
Wolfe, M. Estelle	New York	American University	B. A. (academic psychological business administration).
Woodford, Harold C	West Virginia	Davis-Elkins College, Elkins	B. A.
Young, Dorothy	Alabama	Florence State Teachers' College	B. S.
Zimmers, Neal F	Ohio	Denison University, Granville	B. A. (economics and accountancy).
		$1,620 class	
Acott, Lloyd A	Colorado	Colorado Agricultural College	B. S. (agronomy).
Adney, C. G	Utah	University of Kansas	B. S.
Alewine, William M	Georgia	National University	LL. B.
Alexander, Theodore H	Nebraska	University of Nebraska	B. S. (agriculture).
Anderson, Ervin	Texas	North Texas State Teachers' College	B. A.
Ansley, Fred	Pennsylvania	Washington School of Accounting	B. S.
Armstrong, William Rush	Massachusetts	George Washington University	B. S. (engineering).
Bachman, George V	Iowa	University of Missouri	B. A.
Baker, Charles E	California	Leland Stanford University Georgetown University	B. A., M. A. Ph. D.
Ball, Frederic L	Washington	University of Washington	B. S. (premedical).
Ballantine, Henry T., Jr	Oklahoma	Princeton University	B. S.
Bankhead, John E., Jr	Texas	North Texas State Teachers' College	B. S. (economics and government).
Barnes, Charles M	Arkansas	Georgia School of Technology	B. S. (electrical engineering).
Barnes, Gordon	Kentucky	Asbury College, Wilmore	B. A.
Benjamin, Lemuel George, Jr	South Carolina	University of South Carolina	B. A., LL. B.
Bentley, Osce M	Alabama	Howard College, Birmingham	B. S.
Benton, Luther L	South Carolina	Clemson College, Simmonsville	B. S. (agronomy).
Bergner, John F	Pennsylvania	South Eastern University Silver Bay Y. M. C. A. College	LL. B. C. B. S.
Bergstrom, Kenneth	Minnesota	Gustavus Adolphus College, St. Peter	B. A.
Billingsley, Edward J	Arkansas	Washington University, St. Louis, Mo	B. S. (electrical engineering).
Bogan, John A	Illinois	Catholic University of America	B. S. (chemical engineering).
Boone, John Simeon	North Carolina	Duke University	B. A. (business administration).
Borda, Joseph L	New York	Notre Dame University	B. A.
Bordeau, LeRoy	do	Georgetown University	Ph. B.
Boterweg, Mrs. Cora C	Georgia	Bessie Tift College, Forsythe	B. A., M. B.
Botzenhardt, August, Jr	Montana	University of Montana	B. A.
Bredenberg, Harry T	Nebraska	University of Nebraska	B. S. (business administration).
Brennan, Redmond S., Jr	Missouri	University of Rome, Italy	B. A.
Brist, Uriah M	Iowa	Mount Allison University, Sackville, N. B	B. A.
Brookshire, Joseph O	Florida	University of Mississippi	B. A.
Bryan, Oscar W	Nevada	University of Nevada	B. A.
Buchanan, Mrs. Leah	Missouri	University of Missouri	B. S. (education).
Bullock, R. A	North Carolina	Davidson College, Davidson	B. A.
Burchett, Elsie M	Arizona	University of Arizona	B. S. (business administration).
Burke, Joseph A	Massachusetts	Georgetown University	LL. B.
Burke, Martin L	North Carolina	National University Law School	LL. B.
Burns, William R	Alabama	University of Alabama National University	B. A. LL. B.
Burton, L. W	Oklahoma	William Jewell College, Liberty, Mo	B. A.
Campbell, Fred E	Missouri	University of Missouri	LL. B.
Carrigan, John R	Vermont	University of Vermont	B. S. (commerce and economics).
Carroll, Jerome D	Iowa	Georgetown University	LL. B., Ph. D.
Carroll, Milus H	South Carolina	University of North Carolina	B. S. (commerce).
Carroll, William J	Connecticut	University of Notre Dame	B. A.
Carter, James A	South Carolina	The Citadel, Charleston	B. S. (chemistry).
Chadwick, John R	Alabama	Alabama Polytechnic Institute	B. S.
Chirieleison, Frank	Ohio	George Washington University	B. A. (commerce).
Churchill, Lake G	Illinois	Knox College, Galesburg	B. S.
Cockburn, William F	North Dakota	North Dakota State College	B. S.
Collins, Wilkie, Jr	Oklahoma	Oklahoma A. and M. College	B. S.
Colosimo, J. Vincent	Maryland	University of Maryland	B. A. (business administration).
Congdon, Richard G	New Jersey	George Washington University	B. A.
Consedine, William R	New York	St. Bonaventure's College, St. Bonaventure	B. A.
Conter, William K	Minnesota	Catholic University	B. A.
Cordiner, Margaret E	Wyoming	University of Wyoming	B. S.
Costello, Hilary	Massachusetts	Georgetown Law School	LL. B.
Coster, Albert H	District of Columbia	University of Tennessee Southeastern University, District of Columbia	B. A. B. C. S.
Cox, Donald M	Utah	Utah State Agricultural College	B. S. (animal husbandry and agricultural economics).
Coxen, Mrs. Anne	California	Butler University, Indianapolis University of Maryland	B. A. M. A.
Craven, Mildred A	Massachusetts	University of Wisconsin	B. A. (psychology).
Crites, Robert S	Colorado	Colorado Agricultural College	B. S. (horticulture and agronomy).
Crumpton, J. W	Mississippi	University of Tennessee	M. D.
Davenport, Wayne	Texas	Simmons University, Abilene	B. A.
Davis, John J	North Carolina	Elon College	B. C. S.
Davis, Owen M	Utah	Brigham Young School, Provo	B. A. (biological science), M. A. (agronomy).
Davis, R. H	Georgia	Georgia School of Technology	B. S. (civil engineering)
Dean, Paul J	Illinois	University of Illinois	B. S., LL. B.
Deschamps, Ray	Idaho	Utah State Agricultural College	B. S. (agricultural economics).
Dittmore, Marlin	do	do	B. S. (accounting statistics).
Dotson, William R	Texas	Baylor University, Waco	B. A., LL. B.
Dunne, James E	Rhode Island	Providence College	Ph. B.
Easterling, Carson L	South Carolina	The Citadel, Charleston	B. A. (business administration).
Eastham, Alice	Oklahoma	Oklahoma A. and M. College	B. S.
Endicott, Benjamin E	Arizona	Virginia Military Institute	B. S. (chemical engineering).
English, Edward	Ohio	Georgetown University	B. A., LL. B.
Faiella, Ralph H	New York	St. John's University, Brooklyn Catholic University of America	B. S. M. A.
Farley, Horace B	Michigan	Michigan State College University of Maryland	B. S. (agriculture). M. S. (horticulture).
Farrell, Thomas A	Pennsylvania	American University Georgetown University	B. A. LL. B.
Favrot, J. St. Clair, Jr	Louisiana	Louisiana State University	B. A.
Ferguson, Herbert H	South Carolina	Presbyterian College, Clinton	B. A.
Fickel, Mrs. June M	Iowa	Simpson College, Indianola	B. A.
Figuers, Thomas N	Tennessee	Cumberland University, Lebanon	LL. B.
Fisher, Shelton	do	U. S. Naval Academy	B. S.
Fisher, Walter J	New York	University of Pennsylvania	B. S. (economics).

List of individuals appointed in the Agricultural Adjustment Administration—Continued

Name of employee	Legal residence	College or university from which graduated	Degrees attained
		$1,620 class—Continued	
Fisher, William C.	Virginia	Virginia Polytechnic Institute	B. S. (agriculture).
Fleming, Oliver P., Jr.	Tennessee	Harvard University	B. A.
Frey, William H.	California	Hampden-Sydney College, Hampden-Sydney, Va.	B. A.
		University of Virginia	M. A.
Friedman, George	New Jersey	New York University	B. S., LL. B.
Fritz, Alvin F.	Pennsylvania	Temple University, Philadelphia	B. S. (real estate and commerce).
Fuller, Graham	North Dakota	North Dakota Agricultural College	B. S. (agriculture).
Fulton, Dorothy M.	Nebraska	University of Nebraska	B. S. (education).
Galloway, James H.	South Carolina	University of South Carolina	B. S. (commerce).
Gecenok, Morris	New Jersey	Duke University	B. A.
Gerth, Arthur W.	Missouri	American University	B. A.
Gleim, Irvin V.	Ohio	University of Dayton	B. S. (chemistry).
Gochnauer, Wade A.	do	Mount Union College, Alliance	B. S.
Goodman, Joseph	Wisconsin	University of Wisconsin	B. A. (economics).
Goodman, Robert	do	do	B. A. (commerce).
Graff, Edward E.	Ohio	Ohio State University	B. A.
Grant, George B.	South Dakota	Cornell College, Mt. Vernon, Iowa	B. S. (latin and science).
Graves, Charles G.	Nebraska	Bellevue College, Bellevue	Ph. D.
Greenfield, Max H.	Michigan	Detroit Institute of Technology	B. C. S. (accountancy).
Gyorda, John M.	Pennsylvania	St. Thomas College, Scranton	B. A.
		University of Notre Dame	M. A.
Haddad, Lester M.	Ohio	University of North Carolina	B. S.
Haggerty, LeRoy F.	Connecticut	Georgetown University	Ph. B.
Hall, Charles A.	Massachusetts	Harvard University	B. S. (chemical engineering).
Hall, James H.	Illinois	Millikin University, Decatur	B. S. (commerce and finance).
Ham, Horatio	South Dakota	South Dakota School of Mines, Rapid City	B. S. (electrical engineering).
Hamilton, Ed.	Alabama	University of Alabama	B. S.
Hansen, Lawrence H.	Minnesota	University of Minnesota	E. M.
Hanson, Jesse B.	Georgia	Mercer University, Macon	B. S. (commerce).
Hardy, Leonard D.	Mississippi	University of Mississippi	B. A. (science).
Harned, Joseph D.	Kentucky	Bowling Green Bus. University, Ohio	B. C. S.
Harris, Henry H.	North Carolina	University of Virginia	B. S.
Harris, William F.	District of Columbia	Southeastern University, Washington	B. C. S. (accounting and legal).
Hellmuth, Sybel M.	Virginia	Eastern College, Front Royal	B. A.
Henning, John M.	Colorado	Colorado State College	B. A.
Hildre, George B.	North Dakota	North Dakota Agricultural College	B. S.
Hirst, Edward B.	Wyoming	University of Nebraska	B. A.
Hisle, Clinton M., Jr.	District of Columbia	Southeastern University, Washington	B. C. S. (accounting and commercial law).
Hodgson, Arthur C.	Kansas	University of Kansas	B. A.
Hollingsworth, David W., Jr.	Alabama	Davidson College, Davidson, N. C.	B. A. (history and English).
Homer, David	Utah	Utah State Agricultural College	B. S., M. S.
Hopper, Herman W.	North Carolina	University of North Carolina	B. S. (commerce).
Howell, James D., Jr.	do	Wake Forest College	B. A.
Hoy, John C.	Arizona	Georgetown University	B. A.
		National University Law School	LL. B.
Huckabee, James G.	North Carolina	Duke University	B. A.
Hurley, Henry W.	Tennessee	University of Tennessee	B. S. (civil engineering).
Hutmire, Edward H.	California	Tri State College, Angola, Ind.	B. S. (electrical engineering).
			B. S. (mechanical engineering).
Hynes, James H.	Tennessee	Springhill College, Mobile, Ala	B. A.
Ivey, Reef C.	North Carolina	North Carolina State College	B. S. (agricultural economics and accounting).
Jackelen, Henry J.	Wisconsin	St. Thomas College, St. Paul, Minn.	B. S. (commerce).
Jackson, Frank H.	Utah	Ohio State University	D. V. M.
Jarrett, Charles E.	Montana	Montana State College	B. S. (animal husbandry).
Jay, Louis J.	Colorado	State Technological Institute	B. S. (mechanical engineering and economics).
Jones, Mrs. Marion K.	Maine	Portia Law School, Boston, Mass.	LL. B.
Julicher, Henry A.	New York	Georgetown University	LL. B.
Juricak, Mary Helen	Missouri	University of Kansas	B. A.
Kellam, Nettie Lee	Texas	University of Texas	B. A.
Kells, Robert H.	Wisconsin	Hamline University, St. Paul, Minn.	B. S.
Kellmurray, Bernard M.	New York	Yale University	B. A.
Kelly, Ada Jane	Mississippi	Mississippi State College for Women	B. A.
Kerr, Mrs. Harriet A.	New York	Mount Holyoke College, South Hadley, Mass.	B. A.
Kinzer, Charles W.	Virginia	Roanoke College, Salem	B. S. (chemistry).
Klais, Karl H.	Michigan	University of Michigan	B. A.
Koiner, Arthur W.	Virginia	Virginia Mechanics Institute	E. E.
Kornhauser, Lester L.	Ohio	Ohio State University	B. A.
Koster, Jack L.	Nebraska	Nebraska University	B. S. (civil engineering).
Kroger, John F.	New York	Catholic University	B. S.
Kurtz, Alfred S.	Kentucky	New York University	B. S. (accountancy).
		Columbia University	M. S. (economics).
La Farge, Charles A.	Washington	University of Washington	B. A (journalism).
		George Washington University	M. A. (foreign service).
Landsiedel, E. Erna	Iowa	State University of Iowa	B. A.
Lavelle, Vincent F.	Ohio	University of Notre Dame	B. C. S. (accountancy).
Leary, Edward F.	Connecticut	Georgetown University	Ph. D.
Lillywhite, Don C.	Arizona	Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah	B. S.
Line, Sol	Indiana	Indiana University	B. A.
Lindley, Robert T.	South Dakota	Creighton University, Omaha, Nebr.	Ph. D. (arts and science pharmacy).
Linsenmeyer, George A.	Wyoming	University of Wisconsin	B. A. (economics and engineering).
Logan, R. H.	Washington	Washington State College	B. S. (architecture).
Lovett, Tom S.	Arkansas	University of Arkansas	B. A.
Luecker, Milton E.	Wisconsin	University of Wisconsin	Ph. B. (economics).
Lynch, John K., Jr.	New York	Union College, Schenectady	B. A.
Mabry, Burnett	Mississippi	Spring Hill College, Spring Hill, Ala.	B. S. (commerce).
MacConnell, John C.	North Carolina	Davidson College, Davidson	B. S.
Maher, William F.	Connecticut	College of the Holy Cross	B. A.
Malone, Robertson	Georgia	North Georgia College	B. S.
Marsh, Frank E.	Missouri	Knox College, Galesburg, Ill.	B. S.
Mayer, John M., III	Pennsylvania	George Washington University	B. A.
Mazzola, Alphonse	New York	Niagara University, Niagara Falls	B. S.
McAllister, J. Hector	do	Holy Cross University	B. A. (classical and business administration.
McGarry, J. H.	North Dakota	University of Minnesota	LL. B.
McGuire, James C.	District of Columbia	Georgetown University	A. B., M. A.
McMahan, Leonard C.	North Dakota	Hamline University, St. Paul, Minn.	B. A.
McNew, Vern	Missouri	University of Chicago	B. A.
McRae, Maurice D.	North Dakota	North Dakota Agricultural College	B. S.
McTigue, James J.	Massachusetts	Georgetown Law School	LL. B.
Mekvold, Alf B.	North Dakota	Dickinson State Teachers College	B. A.
Menzie, Hermine	Missouri	University of Chicago	Ph. B., M. A.

List of individuals appointed in the Agricultural Adjustment Administration—Continued

Name of employee	Legal residence	College or university from which graduated	Degrees attained
		$1,620 class—Continued	
Mickler, S. Albert	Florida	Georgetown University	LL. B.
Miller, Harold W	South Carolina	Wofford College, Spartanburg	B. A.
		Duke University	M. A., Ph. D.
Miller, Harris Kirk	Oklahoma	Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical University	B. S. (agricultural administration).
Miller, Kenneth K	Michigan	George Washington University	B. A.
Minicker, Jacob A	Delaware	University of Delaware	B. A.
Monroe, H. Dana	Texas	Baylor University, Waco	B. A.
Moon, George W	Pennsylvania	Penn State College	B. A.
Moore, George H	Virginia	University of Cincinnati	B. A.
Moore, Stuart S	New York	Columbia University	B. L.
Moore, Thomas I	do	Catholic University of America	B. S. (civil engineering).
Moore, William E	Arkansas	Peoples College, Kansas City, Mo	B. A.
Moran, F. A	Oklahoma	Southwestern State Teachers' College	B. S.
Morrow, George W	Wyoming	Missouri Teachers' College	B. S.
Moss, Joseph Alexander	Arkansas	Southwestern College, Memphis, Tenn	B. A.
Mott, Richard H	Maryland	Haverford College, Haverford, Pa	B. S. C.
Murphy, George L	Montana	University of Notre Dame	LL. B.
Murphy, Gerald, J	Vermont	St. Michael's College, Winooski Park	B. A.
Murray, Roland N	South Carolina	Wofford College, Spartanburg	B. A.
Neal, John Richard	New York	Dartmouth College	B. A.
Neary, Bernard A	Connecticut	Georgetown University	B. S. (business and foreign service).
Neas, Mrs. Frieda	Tennessee	North Carolina State College	B. S., M. S.
Neville, James F	New York	Georgetown University	B. A.
Noonan, John F	do	St. Bonaventure College, New York	B. A.
		Georgetown University	LL. B.
Norton, Edwin	South Dakota	Catholic University	B. A.
O'Boyle, William J	Wyoming	St. Mary's College, Kansas	B. S.
O'Brien, J. Frank	do	Columbus University	LL. B.
Ogden, J. F	Utah	Utah State Agricultural College	B. S. (agriculture).
Ogle, James H	Alabama	Howard College, Birmingham	B. A.
O'Kelly, Miss Willie D	Georgia	Southern College, LaGrange	B. A.
		Columbia University	B. S., M. A.
Olson, Emmett K	Utah	University of Utah	B. S., M. E.
Olson, Philip J	North Dakota	North Dakota Agricultural College	B. S. (agriculture).
O'Neil, Annette Cecelia	California	University of California	B. A.
Orr, Donald F	Georgia	University of Georgia	B. A.
Owsley, William A	Oklahoma	Oklahoma A. and M. College	B. S. (agriculture).
Parnell, Furniss L	South Carolina	Wofford College, Spartanburg	B. A.
Payne, Clarke B	Indiana	Indiana State Teachers' College	B. S.
Pearce, Hardy L	Texas	Simmons University, Abilene	B. A.
		George Washington University	B. S., M. A.
Pennington, Joe, Jr	North Carolina	Duke University	B. A.
Peterson, Mrs. Blanche	Kansas	Campbell College	B. A.
Philbin, John M	Ohio	John Carroll University, Cleveland	B. S., M. S.
Phillips, Morris L	Oklahoma	Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College	B. S. (agriculture).
Pilson, T. Alfred	Kentucky	Asbury College, Wilmore	B. A.
Pjerrou, Arch W	Nebraska	Kansas State University	B. A.
Pollack, Abraham	Rhode Island	Rhode Island State College	B. S. (agriculture)
Pollock, Philip B	North Carolina	University of North Carolina	B. A., M. A.
Pooley, John W	Iowa	Grinnell College, Grinnell	B. A. (business administration).
Porter, Alexander M	Oklahoma	George Washington University	B. A.
Potter, Francis P	Pennsylvania	Villanova College, Villanova	C. E., B. S.
Potts, Iry N	Ohio	Ohio State University	B. S.
Powell, Eleanor	New York	Vassar College	B. A.
Powell, George A	Alabama	Mississippi State College	B. S. (agricultural engineering).
Powell, George E	Georgia	Georgia Institute of Technology	B. S. C.
Purdy, Bronson H	New York	Dartmouth College	B. A.
Rainey, Charles A	North Carolina	Mount St. Joseph's College, Philadelphia, Pa	B. A.
Raysor, Clifford R	Florida	Florida Agricultural College	B. A.
Reilly, Mary D	Pennsylvania	Marywood College, Scranton	B. A.
Reynolds, Charles J	California	St. Ignatius College	B. A.
		Georgetown University	M. A.
Reynolds, John J. A., Jr	Rhode Island	Providence College	B. A.
Rhodes, F. Marion	Washington	State Teachers College, Missouri	B. A.
Rhodes, Francis M	Missouri	State Teachers College	B. A.
Richards, Edward H	Kentucky	Davidson College, Davidson, N. C	B. S. (chemistry).
Robertson, Ronald C	South Dakota	South Dakota State School of Mines	M. E.
Robideaux, Phyllis	Minnesota	University of Minnesota	B. A.
Roper, L. Foust	Missouri	University of Missouri	B. J.
Rounsaville, James H	Texas	University of Texas	B. B. A.
Rowe, Ross T	Idaho	Utah State Agricultural College	B. S. (agriculture and mathematics).
Rowland, Virgil	Texas	Texas Technological College	B. A. (economics).
Rupert W. J	Nebraska	University of Nebraska	B. S. (agriculture).
Rush, Eugene A	Texas	University of Texas	B. A.
Sander, Victor Theodore	North Dakota	University of Nebraska	B. S. C. (agriculture).
Savage, Theodore H	Pennsylvania	University of Pittsburgh	B. A.
Scarbrough, Louis	Washington	University of Washington	B. A. (business administration).
Schaeffer, Lowell F	Michigan	Michigan State College	B. S. (economics).
Senf, Catherine	Ohio	Antioch College, Yellow Springs	B. S. (mathematics).
Sherer, Howard	Pennsylvania	Pennsylvania State College	B. A.
Shorrock, Arthur V	Washington	University of Washington	B. A.
Simmons, Benjamin S	Kentucky	University of Maryland	B. A. (business administration).
Simms, George Dyson	Virginia	George Washington University	B. A.
Smith, Mrs. Francys	Kentucky	University of Kentucky	B. S. (commerce).
Smith, James K	Texas	University of North Carolina	B. S. (economics).
Smith, Lloyd T	Mississippi	Southeastern University	B. C. S.
Smith, Michael Paul	Connecticut	Catholic University	B. A. (economics).
Smith, William C	Mississippi	Mississippi State College	B. S. (engineering).
Solem, Custer G	North Dakota	Concordia College	B. A.
Spry, John	Illinois	Yale University	Ph. B.
Spurling, William C	South Dakota	South Dakota State College	B. S (agriculture).
Southam, John E	North Dakota	North Dakota Agricultural College	B. S. (agriculture).
Stanko, Billie	Wyoming	University of Wyoming	B. S. (commerce).
Stockdale, Robert C	New Mexico	Allegheny College, Meadville, Pa	B. A.
		Washington State College	B. S. (agriculture).
Stone, Wayne C	Oklahoma	Oklahoma University	B. A. (economics).
Stroupe, Henry	Arkansas	University of Arkansas	B. A., C. E.
Sugar, Aaron	District of Columbia	Georgetown University	B. S., LL. B.
Sughrue, Cecile Virginia	Kansas	University of Kansas	B. A., M. A.
Swearingen, Carrie H	Mississippi	Edward McGehee College	B. S.
Tall, Asael	Idaho	University of Idaho	B. S. (pramedical).
Taylor, Frank A	Kentucky	Western Kentucky Teachers' College	B. A.
Taylor, Robert A	Texas	Texas Technological Institute	B. A.
Teal, Mrs. Frances Alexander	North Carolina	Winthrop College, Rock Hill, S. C	B. A.
		University of North Carolina	M. A.

List of individuals appointed in the Agricultural Adjustment Administration—Continued

Name of employee	Legal residence	College or university from which graduated	Degrees attained
		$1,620 class—Continued	
Thompson, Marshall A.	North Carolina	Princeton University	B. A., M. A.
Thornton, Harrison A., Jr.	Alabama	University of Michigan	B. A.
Thurlow, Mrs. Winifred B.	Tennessee	Carson-Newman College, Jefferson City Columbia University	B. A. B. S. (home economics).
Tierney, Elizabeth K.	Kentucky	University of Louisville	B. S.
Tilden, Mrs. Thela C.	Kansas	Washburn College, Topeka	B. A.
Todd, Joseph J.	Kentucky	University of Kentucky	B. S. (commerce).
Torrens, Helen B.	Minnesota	State Teachers' College, Missouri	B. S.
Townsend, Robert Mc.	District of Columbia	University of Pennsylvania	B. S.
Trampe, Robert G.	Illinois	University of Illinois	B. A., LL. B.
Triplett, Jewell M.	Missouri	Stephens College, Columbia Southwest State Teachers' College, Springfield	A. A. B. A., B. S.
Turner, Fred N.	Georgia	Atlanta Law School	LL. B.
Turner, Frances E.	Ohio	Ohio Wesleyan University	B. A.
Vanderbeek, Herbert C.	Michigan	Syracuse University Detroit Institute of Technology	B. S. M. S. (business administration).
Varni, Edward J.	California	University of San Francisco	LL. B.
Violett, Robert T.	Maryland	Benjamin Franklin University	B. C. S.
Wade, Thomas D.	Rhode Island	Providence College	B. A.
Walker, John H., Jr.	Texas	University of Texas	B. A.
Walleker, Floyd E.	Alabama	Washington Missionary College, D. C.	B. A.
Warden, Marvin I.	Montana	Iowa State College	B. C. E.
Waring, George S.	Arkansas	Spring Hill College, Mobile, Ala.	B. S.
Warras, John	Michigan	University of Detroit	B. S.
Warren, Clifton C.	Texas	Texas Agricultural and Mechanical College	B. S., M. S.
Watson, Mrs. Lucy	do	Baylor College, Belton	B. A., B. S.
Watts, Mrs. Justine P.	do	College of Industrial Arts, Denton	B. S.
Webb, Paul G.	Missouri	University of Missouri Kansas City School of Law	B. A., B. S. LL. B.
Webb, Robert M.	Texas	Texas Technological College	B. A.
Whims, Edmund J.	Pennsylvania	Lehigh University	C. E.
White, Clark	New York	Syracuse University	B. S. (civil engineering).
Williams, Charles E.	Pennsylvania	Gettysburg College, Gettysburg	B. S.
Williams, George P.	South Carolina	Clemson Agricultural and Mechanical College	B. S.
Wilson, Paul M.	Maryland	Benjamin Franklin University	B. C. S., M. C. S.
Woodward, Julius A.	North Carolina	Wake Forest College	B. S. (mathematics and science), M. A.
Yap, Diosdado M.	Illinois	Crane College Lewis Institute of Technology, Chicago George Washington University National University	A. A. B. S. M. A. M. S.
Yates, William A.	New York	Georgetown University	LL. B.
York, Joseph E.	Montana	Montana State College	B. S. (agriculture).
Youngman, Emma P.	Pennsylvania	Park College, Parkville, Mo. Bucknell University, Lewisburg	B. A. B. A.
Zibart, Carl F.	Tennessee	Vanderbilt University, Nashville	B. A. (English, business and economics).
		$1,800 class	
Abrahamson, Paul E. R.	North Dakota	North Dakota Agricultural College	B. S.
Altenburg, Martin C.	do	do	B. S.
Antwerp, A. J.	Nebraska	Fremont College	B. S. (engineering).
Berntson, Byron	North Dakota	North Dakota State College of Agriculture	B. S.
Biggs, John W.	Oregon	Pike College	M. A.
Bowen, Roy E.	Georgia	University of Georgia	B. A. (journalism).
Bowers, Alfred W.	North Dakota	Beloit College, Beloit, Wis. University of Chicago	B. S. M. A.
Briggs, Hilton M.	do	Iowa State College	B. S. (animal husbandry).
Cannon, Howell Lee	Utah	Utah State Agricultural College	B. S. (agricultural economics).
Catron, Davie	Mississippi	Millsaps College, Jackson	B. A.
Chapman, Fred A.	Alabama	Alabama Polytechnic Institute	B. S.
Dreifbelbis, Ernest G.	Pennsylvania	Pennsylvania State College	B. A.
Dusenberry, Harold L.	Montana	Montana State College	B. S.
Ellingson, Palmer	Wisconsin	University of Wisconsin	B. A.
Ertel, Paul J.	Indiana	Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill.	B. S. (commerce).
Evans, Truett	Texas	Simmons University, Abilene	B. A.
Freeman, William	North Dakota	State College, Fargo	B. S. (agriculture).
Friedman, Maurice	Connecticut	George Washington University	B. A.
Hansen, Harold H.	Mississippi	University of Copenhagen	B. A.
Hecht, Fred J.	Illinois	Loyola University, Baltimore, Md.	B. C. S. (commerce).
Hunt, William L.	Missouri	Carleton College, Farmington Research University, Washington, D. C.	B. A. B. C. S.
Jensen, Chris	North Dakota	Iowa State College	B. S., M. S. (dairying).
Jones, Ewing	Oklahoma	Oklahoma A. and M. College	B. S. (general business).
Jorgenson, Peter	North Dakota	North Dakota Agricultural College	B. S. (agriculture).
Lea, Walter E.	South Carolina	Roanoke College, Salem, Va.	B. A.
Lee, Jesse W.	Puerto Rico	Columbia University	B. A. (chemical engineering).
Manes, Virgil D.	Illinois	University of Illinois	B. S.
Martineau, Charles F., Jr.	California	Utah State Agricultural College	B. S. (agricultural chemistry).
Maxey, Richard P.	Oklahoma	Oklahoma Agriculture and Mining College	B. S. (agriculture).
McConnell, David Moffatt	South Carolina	Davidson College, North Carolina	B. S.
McKenzie, Cedric F.	Minnesota	University of Minnesota	B. S.
McKinnell, Wendel Bollman	Maryland	New York University	B. B. A.
McKinnon, Wayne T.	Wyoming	University of Wyoming	B. S. (agriculture).
Moriarty, Daniel J.	Rhode Island	Georgetown University	LL. B., LL. M.
Mowrer, Delbert	New Mexico	New Mexico Agricultural College	B. S. A.
Mullen, M. Frank	Oregon	Creighton University, Omaha, Nebr.	LL. B.
Munsell, Elmer S.	Connecticut	Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Troy, N. Y.	C. E.
Nicholls, William H.	Kentucky	Univerity of Kentucky	B. A. (german and economics).
Paton, James F.	Texas	Baylor University, Waco	B. A.
Rich, C. Carlyle	Utah	Weber Junior College, Ogden Utah State Agricultural College	A. S. (civil engineering). B. S. (civil engineering).
Rigney, Fleming	New Mexico	New Mexico Agricultural and Mining College	B. S. (agriculture).
Ross, Charles E.	Mississippi	Mississippi State University	B. S. (agriculture).
Rutter, Janet G.	District of Columbia	Cornell University George Washington University	B. A. (economics). LL. B.
Schmidt, Henry G.	Maryland	Johns Hopkins University	B. S. (economics).
Shaw, John Arthur	Rhode Island	Southeastern University, District of Columbia George Washington University	B. C. S. (accountancy). LL. B.
Shaw, K. J.	North Carolina	North Carolina State College	B. S.
Thiel, J. J.	Washington	Grinnell College, Grinnell, Iowa	B. A. (language).
Thompson, Chas. P.	Arizona	University of Arizona	B. S. (agriculture).
Upham, Warren P.	Idaho	University of Maine	B. S. (forestry).
Van Hoy, John	Indiana	Purdue University	B. S. A. (rural economics).
Weeks, Joseph	Virginia	University of Virginia	B. S., M. S.

List of individuals appointed in the Agricultural Adjustment Administration—Continued

Name of employee	Legal residence	College or university from which graduated	Degrees attained
		$1,800 class—Continued	
West, Clarence H	Mississippi	Mississippi State College	B. S. (agriculture).
Whitehead, Walter H	Virginia	Washington and Lee University	B. S. (commerce and business administration).
Wright, Bertram C	Connecticut	Connecticut State College	B. S. (economics).
		$2,000 class	
Akins, S. B	California	University of California	B. S. (agriculture).
Allred, David H	Utah	Brigham Young University, Provo	B. S. (economics).
Austin, Richmond Orrin	Mississippi	Mississippi State College	B. S. (chemistry).
Book, Abraham Benjamin	North Carolina	Duke University	B. A., LL. B.
Bowers, Charles J	Tennessee	University of Tennessee	B. S. (agriculture).
Branch, William V	North Carolina	University of North Carolina	LL. B.
Brokaw, Herbert D	New York	Cornell University	B. S.
Browne, E. Wayles, Jr	Louisiana	Stanford University	B. A.
		Harvard University	M. B. A.
Bryan, Herbert K	Maine	Colby College, Waterville	B. S. (business administration).
Boutz, William F	New Mexico	New Mexico College of Agriculture	B. S. (electrical engineering).
Biggs, Harold W	Louisiana	University of Chicago	B. S. (economics).
Chelf, Walter B	Kentucky	Centre College, Danville	B. A.
		Cumberland University, Lebanon, Tenn	LL. B.
Christian, Ralph W	Georgia	University of Georgia	B. S. (forestry).
Cline, Walter L	Washington	Washington State College	B. A.
Cox, Robert H	Mississippi	University of Mississippi	B. A.
Cox, T. Hillard	Iowa	University of Iowa	B. S., M. A. (commerce).
Cunningham, Horace	Mississippi	Iuka Normal Institute	B. A., B. S.
Dalton, John J	Iowa	Iowa State College	B. S. (animal husbandry). M. S. (agricultural economics).
Davis, Charles V	New York	Y. M. C. A. School of Commerce, Cincinnati, Ohio	B. C. S. (accountancy and business administration).
Dorf, Alfred L	New Jersey	National Law School	LL. B.
Easterbrooks, Wilfred R	Rhode Island	Rhode Island State College	B. S. (civil engineering).
Flythe, Julian T	North Carolina	Wake Forest College	LL. B.
Gachet, Thomas M	Alabama	University of Alabama	B. S.
Gannaway, J. W., Jr	Iowa	Grinnell College, Grinnell	B. A. (business adminstration).
Gelfeld, Albert	District of Columbia	National University	LL. B., LL. M., M. P. L.
Gillis, Leslie, Jr	do	George Washington University	LL. B.
		Virginia Military Institute	B. A.
Goodwin, Ann	Arkansas	University of Missouri	B. J.
Hager, Daniel I	West Virginia	University of West Virginia	LL. B.
Haycraft, Sylvester Jolly	Minnesota	University of Minnesota	B. S. (business administration).
High, Lena B	South Carolina	Limestone College, Gaffney	B. A.
Hole, Erling	Iowa	Iowa State College	M. S. (agricultural economics).
Holland, Joshua H	California	University of California	B. A.
		Harvard University	M. B. A.
Holloway, Jerome K	New York	Neff College	B. S.
Hurd, Hugh C	Arkansas	University of Arkansas	B. S. (business administration).
Johnston, Everett Otis	Illinois	University of Illinois	B. S. (agriculture).
Kadlec, George C	North Dakota	North Dakota Agricultural College	B. S.
Leton, Mercia	Oregon	Northwestern College of Law	LL. B.
Lovendahl, Mrs. Helen A	Wisconsin	University of Wisconsin	B. A. (economics).
Macfarlane, Francis A	New York	St. John's Law College, Brooklyn	LL. B.
Magruder, John K	Virginia	University of Virginia	B. A.
Marchetti, Randolph O	Wisconsin	George Washington University	B. A., LL. B.
Millsap, Reuben	Alabama	University of Alabama	LL. B.
Monson, J. Harold	Utah	Utah State Agricultural College	B. S. (business administration and economics).
Munro, Stanely E	New York	Cornell University	B. S. (agriculture).
Patterson, Walter P	Michigan	University of Detroit	B. A., B. C. S.
Permenter, Eugene S	Tennessee	University of Tennessee	B. S. A.
Resnick, L. Rella	Massachusetts	Radcliffe College, Cambridge	B. A.
		Yale Law School	LL. B.
Robinson, Ben L	South Dakota	Montana State College	B. S. (animal husbandry).
		South Dakota State College	M. S. (dairy husbandry).
Robinson, Mrs. Leo D	Arkansas	National University of Law	LL. B.
Rubel, Donald M	California	University of California	B. S. (agricultural economics).
Scott, Walter W	Virginia	New York University	B. S. (civil engineering).
Selvig, Helen Marion	Minnesota	University of Minnesota	B. A.
Shelton, Farrar V	Virginia	Virginia Polytechnic Institute	B. S. (agriculture).
Sitton, Floyd W	Texas	Simmons University, Abilene	B. A.
Smith, Garland F	do	University of Utah	B. A.
		University of Hanover, Germany	L. S. T.
Smith, Robert H	North Dakota	State College, Dickinson	B. A.
Snelus, Martin J	Texas	National University of Law	LL. B.
Stone, Ewel H	Oklahoma	Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College	B. S. (agricultural administration).
Strother, Claude	West Virginia	University of Michigan	B. S. (agriculture).
		Ohio State University	M. S. (agriculture).
Thompson, Esther K	Wisconsin	Wisconsin University	Ph. B.
Troth, James R	Maryland	University of Maryland	B. A. (economics).
Walsh, Joseph A	New York	Fordham College	B. A., LL. B.
Wendt, Basil S	Nebraska	University of Nebraska	B. S., M. A. (agriculture).
Willis, Arthur B	Georgia	Benjamin Franklin University	B. C. S.
		$2,200 class	
Morgan, Roy L	Virginia	University of Virginia	B. S., LL. B.
		$2,300 class	
Beal, William F	North Carolina	North Carolina State College	B. E.
Bertoglio, James E	Montana	National University	LL. B.
Blair, Coy S	Minnesota	Ellsworth College, Iowa	B. A.
Cox, Charles M	Georgia	Mercer University, Macon	B. A., LL. B.
Danner, Harvey C	Mississippi	Benjamin Franklin University	B. C. S.
France, Douglas C	North Carolina	University of Virginia	B. A.
Gammage, Charles E	Georgia	Georgia School of Technology	B. S., C. E.
Getz, Benjamin L	Pennsylvania	Lehigh University	B. S.
		Georgetown University	LL. B.
Gilson, Albert F., Jr	New Jersey	do	LL. B.
Goldman, Milton	Massachusetts	Boston University	LL. B.
Harris, Jesse M	Tennessee	Cumberland University, Lebanon	LL. B.
Hunt, Thomas S	Iowa	Iowa State College	B. S. A., M. S. A. (agronomy).
Johnson, Albert L	Washington	Washington State College	B. S. (agricultural administration).
Joyce, James A	Pennsylvania	Georgetown University	LL. B.
		National University	B. A. (economics and government)

List of individuals appointed in the Agricultural Adjustment Administration—Continued

Name of employee	Legal residence	College or university from which graduated	Degrees attained
		$2,800 class—Continued	
LaFollette, Walter T	Arkansas	Missouri State University	LL. B.
Lagerson, Linwood E	Maine	Colby College, Waterville	B. S.
Leonhard, Paul B	Indiana	Franklin College, Franklin	B. A.
Lindsay, John T	Wisconsin	Marquette University, Milwaukee	LL. B.
McDill, Paul	Nebraska	University of Nebraska	B. S. (agriculture).
McGuire, Frank	Rhode Island	Georgetown University	LL. B.
McIntire, George B	West Virginia	West Virginia University	B. S.
McMahon, James J., Jr	New York	Fordham Law School	LL. B.
Meehan, Leo J	do	Georgetown University	B. S. (business administration).
		Brooklyn Law School	D. D. L.
Menefee, Melville M	Virginia	Virginia Military Institute	B. S.
Nesbitt, Wallace M	District of Columbia	National University	LL. B.
Newton, Miles C	New York	Cornell University	C. E.
O'Donnell, James A	do	Georgetown University	LL. B.
Orcutt, Edwin P	Montana	Montana State College	B. S. (animal husbandry).
Perkins, Lewis B	Virginia	National University	LL. B.
Pinckney, Rueben M	Minnesota	University of Nebraska	B. S., M. A.
		University of Minnesota	Ph. D.
Posson, Melancthon B	Nebraska	Nebraska College of Agriculture	B. S.
Roberts, James G	New Mexico	Mercer University, Macon, Ga	LL. D.
Venlel, J. Robert	Indiana	Rose Polytechnic Institute, Terre Haute	B. S. (civil engineering).
Wells, James H	Mississippi	Mississippi State College	B. S. (civil engineering).
		$2,600 class	
Ahlbrand, Brunow Walter	Indiana	Purdue University	B. S. (agriculture).
Alexander, Maxie Miller	North Carolina	George Washington University	B. A.
		Georgetown University	D. D. S.
Ayers, Arthur W	Montana	Montana State College	B. S. (agriculture).
Baker, Vernon W	Washington	Washington State College	B. S. (agricultural economics).
Baldwin, Lawrence A	Maryland	University of Pennsylvania	B. S. (agricultural engineering).
Bele, Frank A	Minnesota	University of Minnesota	B. S., M. S. (agriculture).
Berry, Benjamin Clark	Missouri	University of Missouri	B. S. (business and public administration).
Bierly, Stuart J	Illinois	Northwestern University, Chicago	B. S. (commerce).
Bohling, Frederick J	Wisconsin	Marquette University, Milwaukee	B. S. (business administration).
Bonwit, Murray J	New York	City College, New York	B. S.
		New York University	C. P. A.
Booker, George F	Michigan	Iowa State College	B. S. (agronomy).
Brewer, Fletcher F	Arkansas	University of Arkansas	LL. B.
Brown, Kenneth H	North Carolina	North Carolina State College	B. S.
Burbank, Richard W	District of Columbia	Georgetown University	B. F. S. (foreign service).
Burkinshaw, William P	Connecticut	do	B. S. (foreign service).
Burrows, Robert N	Texas	University of Texas	B. A.
		University of Wisconsin	M. A. (economics).
		American University	Ph. D. (economics).
Casteel, Charles G	Georgia	Emory University, Atlanta	LL. B.
Caudle, Charles B	North Carolina	Wake Forest College	LL. B.
Cloonan, Thomas J	New York	Boston University	B. B. A.
Colebank, Andy W	Tennessee	University of Tennessee	B. S. (agriculture).
Columbus, Joseph C	District of Columbia	Benjamin Franklin University	B. C. S.
Cooley, Hubert B	North Carolina	Wake Forest College	B. S.
Cotton, Albert H	do	Duke University	B. A., LL. B.
Council, Charles M., Jr	Georgia	Princeton University	B. A. (economics).
Covington, John M	North Carolina	Wake Forest College	B. S. (commerce).
Crane, Dwight W	Nebraska	University of Florida	B. S.
Dahl, Gerhard H	Illinois	Luther College, Decorah, Iowa	B. A.
Davidson, Robert D	Oklahoma	Oklahoma A. and M. College	B. S. (agricultural administration).
			M. S. (agricultural economics).
Davis, D. Elmer	Massachusetts	Northeastern University	B. C. S. (accountancy).
Davis, Herbert L., Jr	Maryland	University of Maryland	B. S. (statistics and animal husbandry).
Davis, J. Burnam	Kentucky	University of Kentucky	B. A.
Dimitry, Thomas D	Louisiana	College of Immaculate Conception	B. S.
		Loyola University, New Orleans	LL. B., LL. M.
Dinges, Harold R	Virginia	Shenandoah College, Reliance	B. S. (history and science).
Donohue, Francis H	Indiana	St. Viator College, Bourbonnais, Ill	B. A.
Drow, Bernard H	do	University of Wisconsin	B. A. (commerce).
Dunbar, David C	California	University of Utah	B. A.
Emery, Harlan J	do	University of Maine	B. S. (agriculture).
		Oregon State Agricultural College	M. S.
Endersbee, William J	New York	College of Forestry, Syracuse	B. S. F.
Evans, Robert C	Florida	University of Florida	B. S., B. A. (business administration).
Fedderson, Howard C	Colorado	Colorado University	B. A.
Ferguson, Eli	South Dakota	South Dakota State College	B. S. (commerce).
Forrester, Dick R	Missouri	Oklahoma A. and M. College	B. S. (animal husbandry).
		Iowa State College	M. S. (animal nutrition).
Fuchs, Robert H	District of Columbia	American University	B. A.
Fuhrman, George F	Maryland	Baltimore City College	B. S.
		University of Pennsylvania	B. S. (accountancy).
Funk, LeRoy C	Utah	Utah State Agricultural College	B. S. (agriculture).
		Iowa State College	M. S. (agriculture).
Furnell, William W	Oklahoma	Marshall College, Huntington, W. Va	C. P. A.
Gallahue, Edward E	Illinois	Catholic University of America	B. A., M. A.
Gooze, Charles	New York	College of the City of Detroit	B. A.
		Clark University, Worcester, Mass	M. A., Ph. D.
Greenberg, William	do	George Washington University	B. S. (civil engineering).
		St. John's College, Brooklyn	LL. B.
Greenman, John R	Florida	University of Florida	B. S. A.
Crest, Edward G	Minnesota	University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon	B. S. A., M. S. (agriculture and farm management).
Grey, George R	Louisiana	International Accountancy Society	C. P. A.
Groene, Tom U	Florida	University of Florida	B. S. (agricultural economics).
Haggerty, John J	Montana	Montana State College	B. S. (agriculture).
		University of Wisconsin	M. S. (land economics).
Hall, Clifton G	New Hampshire	University of Maryland	B. S.
Hallock, Bernard N	Pennsylvania	Benjamin Franklin University	M. C. S (accountancy).
Hartmann, Emile D	California	University of California	B. S. (civil engineering).
Held, Christian	Indiana	Purdue University	B. S., M. S. (agriculture).
Henika, Franklin S	Wisconsin	University of California	B. S. (agriculture).
		University of Wisconsin	M. S., Ph. D. (genetics).
Henriksen, John H	Utah	Southeastern University of District of Columbia	B. C. S., M. C. S. (accountancy).
Herbert, William H	Mississippi	U. S. Naval Academy	B. S.
Hewitt, Ryland H	New York	Cornell University	B. S. (agriculture).
Hinshaw, R. F	Arkansas	Morningside College, Sioux City, Iowa	B. A. (economics).
Hoffman, George C	Illinois	Northwestern University	C. P. A.

List of individuals appointed in the Agricultural Adjustment Administration—Continued

Name of employee	Legal residence	College or university from which graduated	Degrees attained
		$2,600 class—Continued	
Hoffman, Ralph R.	Kansas	University of Denver	B. S. (commerce).
Holliday, James T., Jr.	Illinois	Washington University, St. Louis, Mo.	B. S.
Human, Ida M.	do	Chicago Law School	LL. B
Jacob, Morey D.	Missouri	St. Louis University School of Commerce	C. P. A.
Jamerson, Roy	Pennsylvania	Clemson College, South Carolina	B. S (business and accounting).
James, Mrs. Margaret H.	Maine	Vassar College	B. A.
		Columbia University	M. A. (statistics and economics).
James, R. Bleakley	Virginia	Washington and Lee University	LL. B.
Jenkins, Eben C.	Maryland	Virginia Polytechnic Institute	M. S., B. S. (agricultural economics and business administration).
Johnson, Paul E.	Minnesota	University of Minnesota	B. A.
Jurgelonis, Cleophas	Lithuania	DePaul College, Chicago, Ill.	LL. B.
Kebric, Harry L.	California	Columbia University	B. S.
		University of Cologne, Germany	Ph. D. (sociology and economics).
Kendall, C. Victor	Ohio	University of Akron	B. S. (scientific agriculture).
		Ohio State University	B. S. A., M. A. (rural economics and administration).
Kirwan, Cornelius A.	California	University of Vermont	B. S.
Koffsky, Nathan M.	New York	Cornell University	B. A. (economics).
Krewatch, Albert V.	Maryland	University of Delaware	B. S., M. S. (electrical engineering).
Lacy, William Sterling Byrd	Colorado	University of Colorado	B. A. (economics).
Leffelman, Louis J.	South Carolina	University of Minnesota	B. S. (forestry).
		Yale School of Forestry	M. S. (forestry).
Levy, Jack I.	Pennsylvania	University of Michigan	B. A., J. D.
Lewis, Laurence E.	District of Columbia	Chiropractic Research University, Army Medical School	D. C.
Lizzi, Julio S.	Massachusetts	Benjamin Franklin University	B. C. S., M. C. S. (accountancy).
Loan, Charles J.	do	Boston University	B. B. A.
Long, Stephen F.	Illinois	St. Viator College, Bourbonnais	B. S. C. (commerce).
Loomis, Robert M.	Wisconsin	University of Wisconsin	Ph. D. (political science).
Lowe, Isadore J.	Massachusetts	Boston University Law School	LL. B.
Lowenstein, Lloyd L.	New York	Cornell University	B. A.
Lukeman, Elmer J.	Illinois	Illinois College	B. A.
Macaulay, John	Michigan	University of Detroit	B. S. (commerce).
Maigret, John A.	Kentucky	Western Kentucky State Teachers' College	B. A.
		Indiana University	M. A.
Mason, Malcolm S.	New York	Columbia College	B. A.
		Columbia Law School	LL. B.
Matthews, Albert J.	Minnesota	Cardiff Technical School	C. E.
McAfee, Wayne D.	Ohio	Iowa State College	B. S.
McCormick, James H.	Illinois	Campion College, Prairie du Chien, Wis.	B. A.
		Georgetown University	M. S.
McEntire, W. Davis	Utah	Utah State Agricultural College	B. S. (economics and political science).
		Duke University	M. A. (economics and political science)
McGuire, William J.	District of Columbia	Georgetown University	B. A., LL. B.
McIntire, Guy F.	Maryland	Northeastern University	B. C. S.
McMurray, Walter	Louisiana	Loyola University, New Orleans	B. A.
McNeil, James F.	New York	Georgetown University Law School	LL. B., LL. M.
Merrifield, Paul D.	Illinois	University of Michigan	B. A.
Mershon, Ralph	Alabama	University of the South, Sewanee, Tenn.	B. S.
		Harvard University	M. B. A.
Miles, Herbert R.	District of Columbia	Benjamin Franklin University	M. C. S.
Miller, Donald C.	Pennsylvania	Pennsylvania State College	B. S.
Miller, T. H., Jr.	Utah	University of Utah	B. S.
Morrison, Arthur R.	New Jersey	University of Southern California	B. A.
Nelson, Arthur B.	North Dakota	North Dakota State College	B. S. (agriculture).
Newson, William C.	Tennessee	Iowa State College	B. S.
Nixon, Alvar J.	Minnesota	University of Minnesota	B. B. A.
Noble, Leonard	South Dakota	South Dakota State College	B. S. (animal husbandry).
O'Brien, J. Harold	Montana	University of Chicago	B. S.
O'Mahony, William J.	do	Georgetown University	LL. B.
Perkins, Thomas N.	Massachusetts	Harvard University	B. A., LL. B.
Otten, Russell J.	Indiana	Purdue University	B. S. A.
Painter, Samuel R.	West Virginia	Roanoke College, Salem, Va.	B. S.
Panossian, Aram G.	New York	Brusa Agricultural College, Turkey	B. S.
		Washington College of Law	LL. B.
Parks, Wallace J.	Maryland	Williams College, Williamstown, Mass.	B. A.
Phucas, Andrew B.	Massachusetts	University of Maryland	B. S. (dairying).
		Cornell University	M. S. (agricultural engineering).
Powell, William H.	California	University of Kansas	LL. B.
Prichard, George L.	North Carolina	University of North Carolina	B. A.
Priode, Carl N.	Virginia	Virginia Polytechnic Institute	B. S. (agronomy).
Proulx, Emil A.	California	Gonzaga College and University, Spokane, Wash.	B. A.
		University of Minnesota	B. S. (business).
Pyne, Sydney A.	Illinois	Northwestern University	C. P. A.
Quinn, William H.	Oregon	St. Marys' College, Emmitsburg, Md.	C. P. A.
Radabaugh, James H.	West Virginia	Iowa State College	B. S. (agriculture).
Richards, Samuel E.	Oklahoma	Georgetown Law School	LL. B.
Rochester, Morgan C.	South Carolina	Clemson College	B. S. (agriculture).
		University of Florida	M. S. (agricultural economics).
Romen, Anthony B.	New York	Washington School of Accountancy	C. P. A., B. C. S.
Rubenstein, Jacob H.	Virginia	Columbia College	B. S.
Schalet, Jacob J.	New York	St. John's University Law School, Brooklyn	LL. B.
Schickele, Rainer	District of Columbia	Landwirtschaftiche Hochschule, Berlin, Germany	Ph. D.
Schweitzer, F. Vernon	Texas	University of Southern California	B. A. (commerce and sociology).
Schwenger, Robert B.	Wisconsin	University of Wisconsin	B. A. (economics).
Shields, Joseph J.	Pennsylvania	LaSalle College, Philadelphia	B. A.
Shumway, Kenneth G.	Wisconsin	University of Wisconsin	B. A.
Simcox, Glenn R.	Iowa	Georgetown University	LL. B.
Smith, LaFayette R.	Georgia	University of Georgia	B. S. A.
Smith, Thomas L.	South Carolina	Clemson A. and M. College	B. S. (agriculture).
Spilman, Robert F.	Wisconsin	Oklahoma A. and M. College	B. S. (agriculture).
Stocking, Frank A.	Texas	Columbia University	B. A. (economics).
Struwe, Earl L.	do	College of Texas	B. S. (agricultural administration).
Sturke, Louis, Jr.	New York	Harvard University	B. A.
Sufrin, Arthur U.	Pennsylvania	Wharton School of the University of Pennsylvania	B. S. (economics).
Taylor, John Samuel	South Carolina	University of South Carolina	B. S. (commerce).
Templeton, Mrs. Margaret R.	Wisconsin	University of Wisconsin	B. A., M. A.
Terry, George M.	Oklahoma	George Washington University	LL. B.
Thompson, Howard W.	California	University of California	B. A. (economics).
		Harvard University	M. B. A.

List of individuals appointed in the Agricultural Adjustment Administration—Continued

Name of employee	Legal residence	College or university from which graduated	Degrees attained
		$2,600 class—Continued	
Tipton, James C	North Carolina	University of North Carolina	B. A.
Travis, Joseph J	New York	New York University	B. C. S. (accountancy and foreign trade).
Tripp, John Earl	Minnesota	Iowa State College	B. S. (animal husbandry).
Turner, George A	Georgia	University of Georgia	B. S. A.
Varnell, Malcolm K	Maryland	Georgetown University	LL. B.
Vaughan, Ross L	North Carolina	Wake Forest College	B. A.
Wager-Smith, David R. W	New Mexico	New Mexico Agricultural and Mechanical College	B. S. (civil engineering).
Walston, Frank L	North Carolina	University of North Carolina	B. A.
Walstrom, Joe D	Missouri	George Washington University	B. A.
Warner, Earl E	Ohio	Ohio Wesleyan University	B. A.
		Ohio State University	M. A. (political science).
Wermel, Michael T	New York	New York University	B. S. (economics).
		Columbia University	M. S.
Wilson, James A	California	State Agricultural College, University of Minnesota	B. S. A.
Wolf, John F	New York	University of Pennsylvania	B. S. (economics).
Woodruff, Marion T	Iowa	National University, School of Law	LL. B.
Young, Martin G	Florida	University of Florida	B. S. A., M. S. A. (agricultural economics).
Young, Percy C	Tennessee	Trinity College, Durham, N. C	B. A.
Youngs, Frederic A	Texas	Tulane University, New Orleans, La	B. B. A.
Zitzman, Adolph W	Illinois	John Marshall Law School	LL. B.

Mr. BANKHEAD. This list indicates that 1,094 persons, with college degrees, have been appointed to positions in the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, within the salary range indicated, outside the classified service.

Certainly no governmental agency can show a higher type personnel.

I am of the opinion—and I think with this statement the Civil Service Commission will agree—that for the general run of clerical positions in the classified civil service, no more appropriate examination can be had than a proven statement of the requisite education, plus an intelligence test, together with such character examination as may be deemed necessary. This is essentially the test given in the Agricultural Adjustment Administration for nonclassified positions.

I shall not vote for any extension of the classified civil service unless there is vested in the Chief Executive ample power to protect policy-forming positions, to the end that the President as well as the heads of the several executive departments and independent governmental establishments may have in key positions persons who are in full accord and sympathy with the aims, purposes, and ambitions of the administration, be it Democratic or Republican. On the administration in power rests the responsibility for carrying out its program and policies; and I shall oppose any extension of the classified service which would deny the appointing power sufficient latitude to enable him to secure both loyalty and efficiency on the part of those who execute the administrative program. There can be a merit system such as has existed in the Department of Agriculture under the able leadership of Henry A. Wallace and Chester C. Davis without the positions necessarily being in the classified civil service.

We may have the best form of government in the world and a poor personnel functioning under that form, and we will have poor government; or we may have a poor form of government and a good personnel functioning under such form, and we will have good government. In other words, I fully agree with Alexander Pope in his Essay on Man when he wrote:

> For forms of government let fools contest;
> Whate'er is best administer'd is best.

BOUNDARY LINE BETWEEN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AND VIRGINIA

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Order of Business 308, House Joint Resolution 134, the proposal to continue for 9 months the commission for determining the boundary line between the District of Columbia and the State of Virginia. I will state that the authorization is $10,000, which is necessary for the purpose of enabling the commission to complete its labors.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator the reason for taking up the joint resolution out of order.

Mr. ROBINSON. The commission's time has expired, and it is unable to function further until his measure is passed.

Mr. McNARY. Has the joint resolution been reported favorably by the committee?

Mr. ROBINSON. It has passed the House of Representatives and has been unanimously reported by the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia. The chairman of the committee had expected to call up the joint resolution for consideration at this time, but he is not present.

Mr. McNARY. I have no objection to the consideration of the joint resolution, in view of the statement made by the Senator from Arkansas.

There being no objection, the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 134) to continue the commission for determining the boundary line between the District of Columbia and the State of Virginia for not to exceed 9 additional months, and to authorize not to exceed $10,000 additional funds for its expenses was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the commission to determine the boundary line between the District of Columbia and the State of Virginia created under the act entitled "An act to provide for the appointment of a commission to establish the boundary line between the District of Columbia and the Commonwealth of Virginia", approved March 21, 1934 (48 Stat. 453), as constituted on the date of enactment of this resolution, shall continue to function under such act until the completion of its report, but not after December 1, 1935.

SEC. 2. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of such act and the payment of salaries and compensation under such act, the sum of $10,000 is hereby authorized to be appropriated in addition to any sums authorized prior to the date of enactment of this resolution.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. GLASS. 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. LEWIS in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting a nomination and a convention, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

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

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. PITTMAN, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported favorably the nominations of John P. Hurley, of New York, and David B. Macgowan, of Tennessee, now Foreign Service officers of class 3 and consuls, to be consuls general.

Mr. KING, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported favorably the nomination of Clifton Mathews, of Arizona, to

be United States circuit judge, ninth circuit, to succeed William H. Sawtelle, deceased.

Mr. LOGAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported favorably the nomination of John M. Moore, of Kentucky, to be United States marshal, eastern district of Kentucky, to succeed James H. Hammons, term expired.

Mr. BARKLEY, from the Committee on the Library, reported favorably the nomination of Robert D. W. Connor, of North Carolina, to be Archivist of the United States, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

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

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The calendar is in order.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Charles T. Fisher, Jr., of Michigan, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, information reached me a few moments ago through the assistant secretary of the minority, Mr. Foster, that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. HASTINGS] could not be present at this time, and asked that the nomination go over for the day. I make this statement because the information reached me only a short time ago.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I assume it is reasonable to ask for one further day's delay in the consideration if any Senator seeks it, but I should like to give notice that I shall resist any further effort to postpone action on the nomination, because there is not one reason on earth why it should not be confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On request of the Senator from Oregon, the nomination will go over.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

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

CLIFTON MATHEWS

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I was instructed this morning by the Judiciary Committee to report favorably the nomination of Clifton Mathews, of Arizona, to be United States circuit judge, ninth circuit, to succeed William H. Sawtelle, deceased. The Senator from Delaware [Mr. HASTINGS] is a member of the Subcommittee on the Judiciary which passed upon the nomination. It is a unanimous report, and there is no objection. Judge Sawtelle died some time ago, and there is a vacancy which ought to be filled promptly.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, did the committee act on the nomination favorably?

Mr. KING. Yes; the committee acted upon it favorably today. It was referred to the subcommittee last week and the subcommittee considered it very fully. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the nomination.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I do not think anything has been said by the Senator from Utah that would indicate an emergency. In view of that situation I think the nomination should go over.

Mr. KING. Very well; I withdraw the request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nomination will be placed on the calendar.

RECESS

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, as in legislative session, it is now my purpose to move a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow, but I wish to give notice that hereafter I am going to ask the Senate to remain in session until a reasonably late hour and try to dispose of the amendments to the joint resolution. I shall ask the Senate to remain in session until at least 6 o'clock, and possibly later.

I now move, as in legislative session, that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the Senate, in legislative session, took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 19, 1935, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate March 18 (legislative day of Mar. 13), 1935

SOLICITOR GENERAL

Stanley Reed, of Kentucky, to be Solicitor General, vice James Crawford Biggs, resigned.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 18 (legislative day of Mar. 13), 1935

POSTMASTERS

ARKANSAS

Author M. Steele, Gentry.
Will A. Bostick, Van Buren.

KENTUCKY

William T. Carlin, Buechel.
Ruby V. Vaughn, Clay.
John A. Goodman, Elkton.
Joe R. Richardson, Glasgow.

MICHIGAN

Frank E. Kroc, Alanson.
Henry W. Boyle, Bark River.
Mayme Arnestad, Marenisco.
John C. Vaughan, Trout Creek.

NEBRASKA

John F. McGill, Center.
George J. Scott, Crawford.
Albert J. Nacke, Hebron.
George D. Parker, Johnson.
Herman Stahly, Milford.
Mable A. Foreman, Palmyra.
Charles J. Mullaney, Walthill.

NEW YORK

Glen H. Smith, Mexico.

TEXAS

James C. Erwin, Alto.
Luther G. Porter, Bangs.
Albert P. Hinton, Columbus.
Anton C. Mussil, Granger.
Fred M. Carrington, Marquez.
Robert H. Patterson, Mullin.

VERMONT

Daniel P. Healy, White River Junction.

WASHINGTON

Fred E. Booth, Castle Rock.
Edith M. Lindgren, Cosmopolis.
Lonnie L. Grant, Langley.
Leonard McCleary, McCleary.
Leon L. Stock, Marysville.
Peyton B. Hoover, Rochester.
Raymond M. Badger, Winthrop.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MARCH 18, 1935

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

O Shepherd and Bishop of our souls, Thou hast again opened Thine hand and showered blessings upon us. We pray that we may show our gratitude to Thee by serving wisely and lovingly our country and our homes. By the breath of Heaven and the currents of earth, forever hold us

from the cruel sin of ingratitude, which wrings suffering hearts and freezes the finest emotions of the human breast. Blessed Lord, keep our faith in men undimmed, and may we pour into them the spirit of a conquering life, which is the supreme chivalry of earth. Heavenly Father, be merciful to deliver us from the misunderstandings, the misrepresentations, and the exasperations which poison life. Give to all who thus suffer, beauty for ashes, the oil of joy for mourning, and the garment of praise for the spirit of heaviness. Guide all who wander; give certitude to the oppressed and help to all who are perplexed. O let love do its perfect work, and Thine shall be the praise forever. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, March 15, 1935, was read and approved.

CASIMIR PULASKI

Mr. PETTENGILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Joint Resolution 107, authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski.

This is a matter in which at least 75 Members of the House are interested and there is no opposition that I know of, and I hope there will be no objection to this request.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, from what committee does this joint resolution come?

The SPEAKER. From the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand this bill is on the Consent Calendar, which is to be called this afternoon, and while I am in favor of the bill——

Mr. SNELL. I think I am, too.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I do not think this unusual procedure should be followed. A large number of people are in favor of the measure, and if it is not reached on the call of the Consent Calendar this afternoon I would be in favor of one of the advocates of the bill calling it up before we adjourn tonight. There are a number of people who have worked on this bill for years around here, but I do not think this unusual procedure should be followed.

Mr. PETTENGILL. It will only take 2 or 3 minutes to dispose of it.

Mr. SNELL. If we start this procedure we will have to follow it for some other request.

Mr. McFARLANE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would call attention to the fact there is legislation pending making Armistice Day, November 11, a proper holiday, and I see no reason why this measure should take precedence over that one. I think we should pass legislation declaring November 11 a proper holiday.

Mr. PETTENGILL. I will go along with the gentleman. The gentleman and I can agree very nicely about that.

Mr. McFARLANE. I see no reason why this measure should go ahead of that one.

Mr. DUFFEY of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this matter has been before the Committee on the Judiciary. Is the gentleman a member of the Committee on the Judiciary and by what authority has he submitted this request?

Mr. PETTENGILL. I am not a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, but in two previous Congresses I have moved the adoption of a similar resolution. This is a duplicate of a bill of my own. The one on the calendar is that of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. CITRON], and I am calling up his bill with his approval.

Mr. DUFFEY of Ohio. I may say that this procedure has not been authorized by the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this bill has been reported out and there is also a measure to celebrate Leif Ericson Day and five or six more bills of a similar character.

Mr. Speaker, this bill provides for this celebration for 1 year. A similar bill was passed in the last Congress for last year. If we are going to continue this custom, why not make all these occasions national holidays and have the flag up all the time, rather than just passing a bill each year the purpose of which is political in character? I think if the matter is worthy of being brought up and being made permanent, that is one thing, but I do object to bringing up these bills each year for political effect. If we are going to bring them up for political effect, let us bring them up just in the election years; or if it is proper in all years, let us make it permanent. I do not want to object, but I want the House to think about this.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I should like to know what we are trying to do here.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana has asked unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of a joint resolution which the Clerk has reported.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Is this bill on the Consent Calendar?

The SPEAKER. It is.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Why take up any measures on the Consent Calendar out of order? Under a reservation of the right to object, I would like to submit this question to the gentleman.

Mr. PETTENGILL. If I may say so, a number of Members who are interested in this particular resolution want to be on the floor at the time it is brought up and I asked the Speaker if he would recognize me at this time and we have notified these Members to be present, so far as we could, and that is the reason for the request at this time.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. PETTENGILL. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. PETTENGILL. Mr. Speaker, will this joint resolution be in order at the end of the day after the disposition of the cotton bill?

The SPEAKER. If the Consent Calendar is reached, it will be in order when reached on that calendar, and it will also be in order at any time during the day for the gentleman to renew his request.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to work any hardship on anybody here and if there is any special reason why this matter should come up out of order I shall withdraw my objection, but my position, as one who defends the Consent Calendar on this side, is that I think these things should come up in their order. This bill is on the calendar and so far as I know on our side there is no objection to it, and my only purpose in objecting is to protest the consideration of the calendar in the regular way.

Mr. PETTENGILL. The gentleman, perhaps, has not been receiving the large number of telegrams that others have received from Polish-American organizations all over the United States trying to get this measure disposed of today.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to make a statement for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this minute to explain in advance the unanimous-consent request I am going to prefer after the minute expires. It is to take up a bill to confer the Congressional Medal of Honor upon Gen. Adolphus Washington Greely, who 1 week from tomorrow will be 91 years old.

That bill is on the Private Calendar and therefore cannot be put on the Consent Calendar, and we wish the bill to pass the House today. I believe it can be passed by the Senate tomorrow, and I have the assurance of the floor leader of the Senate that he will be glad to try to pass it, with the Senate's consent, and it can be passed and approved by the President by the ninety-first birthday of that grand old hero who first

explored the Arctic regions, and present him with the medal of honor so long past due.

I therefore, Mr. Speaker, ask unanimous consent that the bill (H. R. 5322) authorizing the President of the United States to present in the name of Congress a Medal of Honor to Maj. Gen. Adolphus Washington Greely be taken up for immediate consideration.

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

Mr. SNELL. As I understand from the reading of the bill, it does not carry any provision giving him the privileges of the floor—and probably a man 91 years old would not exercise that privilege. But it is the principle that I am interested in.

Mr. McSWAIN. I beg to assure the gentleman that I have investigated the rule and this does not confer the thanks of Congress, but simply confers the Congressional Medal of Honor.

Mr. REED of New York. Reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I was wondering why this bill, if on the Consent Calendar, should be taken up at this time.

Mr. McSWAIN. It is not on the Consent Calendar, and cannot be, because it is on the Private Calendar.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, and I am not going to object, I want to commend the gentleman from South Carolina for bringing in this bill. General Greely is a native of Massachusetts and a noted explorer.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized to present in the name of Congress a medal of honor to Maj. Gen. Adolphus Washington Greely, United States Army, retired, for his life of splendid public service, begun on March 27, 1844, having enlisted as a private in the United States Army on July 26, 1861, and by successive promotions was commissioned as major general February 10, 1906, and retired by operation of law on his sixty-fourth birthday.

Under leave to extend his remarks, Mr. McSWAIN offers the report of the Committee on Military Affairs on H. R. 5322, for printing in the RECORD, giving detailed information concerning the public services of General Greely:

The Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 5322) authorizing the President of the United States to present in the name of Congress a medal of honor to Maj. Gen. Adolphus Washington Greely, having considered the same, submit the following report thereon with the recommendation that it do pass.

The following is a statement of the military service of Gen. Adolphus Washington Greely:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
THE ADJUTANT GENERAL'S OFFICE,
Washington, January 28, 1935.

STATEMENT OF THE MILITARY SERVICE OF ADOLPHUS WASHINGTON GREELY

Born in Newburyport, Mass., March 27, 1844. Appointed from Louisiana, private, corporal, and first sergeant, Company B, Nineteenth Massachusetts Infantry, July 26, 1861, to March 18, 1863; second lieutenant, Eighty-first United States Colored Infantry, March 18, 1863; first lieutenant, Eighty-first United States Colored Infantry, April 14, 1864; captain, Eighty-first United States Colored Infantry, March 26, 1865; honorably mustered out, March 22, 1867; second lieutenant, Thirty-sixth United States Infantry, March 7, 1867; accepted, May 20, 1867; unassigned, May 19, 1869; transferred to Fifth Cavalry, July 14, 1869; first lieutenant, Fifth Cavalry, May 27, 1873; captain, June 11, 1886; brigadier general, Chief Signal Officer, March 3, 1887; accepted, March 8, 1887; major general, February 10, 1906; accepted, February 10, 1906; retired, March 27, 1908. (By operation of law, sec. 1, act June 30, 1882.)

VOLUNTEER RECORD

He entered the service as a private in Company B, Nineteenth Massachusetts Infantry, July 26, 1861; was promoted corporal, May 15, 1862, and first sergeant, January 1, 1863.

He served with his regiment in the Army of the Potomac until wounded at the Battle of Antietam, Md., September 17, 1862; was absent on account of wound to November 1862, and with his regiment to March 18, 1863, when he was mustered in as second lieutenant, Eighty-first United States Colored Troops; was promoted first lieutenant, April 26, 1864, and captain, April 4, 1865.

He received the brevet of major of Volunteers March 13, 1865, "for faithful and meritorious services during the war."

He served with his regiment, Eighty-first United States Colored Infantry, in the Department of the Gulf (being on sick leave from Oct. 6 to Nov. 15, 1864) until his muster out of service, November 30, 1866, and was then retained in service on detached duty in New Orleans, La., to March 22, 1867, when honorably mustered out.

REGULAR ARMY SERVICE

He joined his company August 7, 1867, and served with it at Fort Bridger, Wyo., from August 7, 1867, to November 1867, and at Fort Douglas, Utah, to October 8, 1868; was on duty as Acting Signal Officer, in the office of the Chief Signal Officer, Washington, D. C., to March 29, 1869, and as Chief Signal Officer, Department of the Platte, to March 8, 1871. He joined the Fifth Cavalry March 15, 1871, and served with it at Fort Laramie, Wyo., to July 15, 1871. He was on duty in the office of the Chief Signal Officer, Washington, D. C., from July 29, 1871, to June 19, 1881. While on this assignment he was absent on signal duty, tours of inspection, etc., as follows: February 17 to November 19, 1873; December 1, 1873, to August 25, 1874; September 28 to December 2, 1874; December 3, 1874, to March 13, 1875; in charge of military telegraph line, Denison, Tex., March 26, 1875, to May 24, 1876, and on leave of absence to November 24, 1876; February 5, 1877, to January 1878; at St. Paul, Minn., and Bismarck, Dakota Territory, June 6, 1878, to January 6, 1879. He commanded the Lady Franklin Bay Expedition from June 20, 1881, sailing from St. Johns, Newfoundland, July 4, until rescued by the expedition under the command of Captain Schley, United States Navy, near Cape Sabine, June 22, 1884; landed at St. Johns, Newfoundland, July 17, 1884; on temporary duty at Portsmouth, N. H., August 1 to October 6, 1884, and was on sick leave to November 22, 1884, when he returned to duty in the office, Chief Signal Officer, Washington, D. C., where he served until December 13, 1886; in charge of the office of the Chief Signal Officer, to March 7, 1887; Chief Signal Officer and in charge of War Department library, March 8, 1887, to February 10, 1906, being on various occasions on detached service abroad. He visited Cuba March 25 to April 11, 1899; attended a meeting of the National Geographic Society at Berlin, Germany, September 14 to October 14, 1899; in the Philippine Islands, Japan, England, and France, on special service, May 24 to November 7, 1901; Alaska, in connection with Alaska cable, June 27 to August 15, 1902; in London, England, attending International Telegraphic Congress, May 12 to June 14, 1903; Berlin, Germany, Conference on Wireless Telegraphy, July 22 to August 29, 1903; in Alaska and Ottawa, Canada, June 14 to August 15, 1904; Berlin, Germany, on public business, August 20 to September 7, 1904.

He was frequently on detached service to various points in the United States in connection with the duties of his office, the installation of electrical equipment for the use of the Army, and the laying of cables.

Following his appointment as a major general, he was on special duty in the office of the Chief of Staff to February 13, 1906; commanding the Division of the Pacific March 9, 1906, to (temporarily commanding the Department of Columbia, July 24 to Aug. 3, 1906, and the Department of California, July 26 to Aug. 2, 1906) August 7, 1906; on leave of absence to September 9, 1906; commanding the Northern Division at St. Louis, Mo., from September 16, 1906, to (temporarily commanding Department of Dakota, Sept. 16 to Oct. 2, 1906; Department of Missouri, Oct. 3–29, 1906; Department of Missouri, Dec. 5, 1906, to May 21, 1907) November 13, 1906. He was in charge of the relief work of the Army following the San Francisco earthquake after April 22, 1906. He was in command of the Northern Division, Chicago, Ill., to July 7, 1907; Vancouver Barracks, Wash., commanding Department of Columbia, to December 10, 1907; St. Paul, Minn., commanding the Department of Dakota, December 11–24, 1907; on leave of absence from December 25, 1907, to the date of his retirement.

He was designated to represent the War Department to assist His Excellency John Hays Hammond, Ambassador Extraordinary, at the coronation of King George V of England, in June 1911.

General Greely was awarded the Purple Heart with oak-leaf cluster on account of wounds received in action June 30, 1862, at Battle of Glendale, Va., and September 17, 1862, at Battle of Antietam, Md., while serving as a corporal, Company B, Nineteenth Regiment of Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry. Silver Coronation Medal of Great Britain, 1911.

General Greely is still on the retired list of the Army. Latest address, 3131 O Street NW., Washington, D. C.

By authority of the Secretary of War:

[SEAL] JAMES F. McKINLEY,
Major General,
The Adjutant General.

The following concerning Maj. Gen. Adolphus Washington Greely is taken from Who's Who in America, 1934–35, volume 18:

"Maj. Gen. Adolphus Washington Greely, United States Army; born, Newburyport, Mass., March 27, 1844; son of John Balch and Frances (Cobb) Greely; graduated Newburyport High School, 1860; married Henrietta H. C. Nesmith, June 20, 1878; children—Antoinette, Adola, John Nesmith, Rose Ishbel, Adolphus W., Gertrude Gale. Served in Civil War, 1861–65, private to captain, and received the brevet of major of volunteers (thrice wounded); appointed second lieutenant, Thirty-sixth United States Infantry, March 7, 1867; first lieutenant, Fifth Cavalry, May 27, 1873; captain, June 11, 1886; brigadier general, Chief Signal Officer, United States Army, March 3, 1887; major general, February 10, 1906. First volunteer private soldier of Civil War to reach grade of brigadier general, United States Army. Constructed 2,000 miles military telegraph in Texas, Dakota, and Montana, 1876–79; in pursuance of recommendation of Hamburg International Geographical Congress (1879) was placed, 1881, in command of United States expedi-

tion to establish 1 of a chain of 13 circumpolar stations; his party of 25 reached farther north (83°24') than any previous record; discovered new land north of Greenland and crossed Grinnell Land to the Polar Sea; 2 relief expeditions failed to reach the party, which retreated south to Cape Sabine, where, relief still failing, the party largely perished of starvation, only 7 survivors being found by third expedition under Capt. Winfield S. Schley.

"During military operations abroad (1898–1902) there were built and operated under his direction 1,000 miles of telegraph in Puerto Rico, 3,800 miles in Cuba, 250 miles in China, and 13,500 miles of lines and cables in Philippine Islands; installed system of 3,900 miles of telegraph lines, submarine cables, and wireless in Alaska, 1900, 1904, the wireless section of 107 miles, from Nome to St. Michael, being the first successful long-distance wireless operated regularly as part of a commercial system. Member of board to regulate wireless telegraphy in United States, 1904; member of board to report on coast defenses of United States, 1905; United States delegate to International Telegraph Conference, London, 1903; and International Wireless Telegraph Conference, Berlin, 1903. Commanding Pacific Division and in charge relief operations, San Francisco earthquake sufferers, April–August 1906; commanding Northern Division, 1906; Department of Columbia, 1907; retired by operation of law, 1908. Gold medalist, Royal, American, and French Geographic Societies.

"Author of Isothermal Lines of the United States, 1881; Chronological List of Auroras, 1881; Diurnal Fluctuations of Barometric Pressure, 1891; Three Years of Arctic Service, two volumes, 1885; Proceedings of Lady Franklin Bay Expedition, 1888; American Weather, 1890; American Explorers, 1894; Handbook of Arctic Discoveries, 1896; Rainfall of Western States and Territories, 1888; Climate of Oregon and Washington, 1889; Climate of Nebraska, 1890; Climatology of Arid Region, 1891; Climate of Texas, 1891; Public Documents First Fourteen Congresses of United States, 1900; Handbook of Polar Discoveries, 1909; Handbook of Alaska, 1925; True Tales of Arctic Heroism, 1912; Reminiscences of Travel and Adventure, 1927; Polar Regions in Twentieth Century, 1928; Representative United States of America at Coronation of George V of England, 1911.

"Address, Cosmos Club, Washington, D. C."

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

On motion of Mr. MCSWAIN, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

PAYMENT OF WORLD WAR ADJUSTED-SERVICE CERTIFICATES

Mr. O'CONNOR, Chairman of the Committee on Rules, by direction of that committee, reported the following rule, which was read, referred to the House Calendar, and ordered printed:

House Resolution 165

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of H. R. 3896, "A bill to provide for the immediate payment of World War adjusted-service certificates, to extend the time for filing applications for benefits under the World War Adjusted Compensation Act, and for other purposes"; and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived; that after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 10 hours, to be evenly divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority members of the Committee on Ways and Means, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as substitute amendments for the bill any such amendments that relate to the payment of World War adjusted-service certificates, and such substitute amendments shall be in order, any rule of the House to the contrary notwithstanding. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except two motions to recommit, with or without instructions: *Provided, however*, That if the instructions in such motions relate to the payment of World War adjusted-service certificates, they shall be in order, any rule of the House to the contrary notwithstanding.

WE THE PEOPLE

Mr. LEE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address which I made at Martinsburg, W. Va., to the Old Hickory Club on the anniversary of the birth of Andrew Jackson.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address which I delivered at Martinsburg, W. Va., March 15, 1935, before the Old Hickory Club, on the occasion of the anniversary of the birth of Andrew Jackson at the annual Jackson Day dinner:

Richard Henry Lee made a motion that the Colonies declare their independence. Thomas Jefferson reduced that motion to writing, which is now a venerable document, and Gen. George Washington and the colonial troops made it effective.

The Revolution itself was a democratic movement. Its controlling motive was stimulated by democratic ideas. All of the typical Revolutionary utterances breathe throughout the spirit of democracy. This spirit is the essential and living element in the Declaration of Independence.

Then there came the Constitutional Convention, and from it the Constitution. In the very first words of that great document we see the influence of this formulating, crystallizing democracy. How does the preamble begin? Being the supreme law of the land, it must begin by naming the authority from whence it came. Since all just power comes from the consent of the governed, the preamble to the Constitution begins by naming this fountainhead from which power emanates. It begins with these thrilling words of democracy: "We, the people * * *"—"We, the people of the United States * * * do ordain and establish this Constitution."

Not George Washington, not Benjamin Franklin, not Alexander Hamilton, but "We, the people."

It was not "I, the king", nor "I, the prince", nor "I, the czar", nor, "I, the mikado", nor "I, the emperor", but "We, the people."

At the beginning of Washington's administration the wealthy, aristocratic classes were in control. Alexander Hamilton, a Federalist, was Secretary of the Treasury. He set to work to establish a moneyed aristocracy as the permanent ally of the Government.

This tendency of the new government toward a plutocracy crystalized the opposition, thus unifying the Democratic feeling throughout the States, thereby formulating the national Democratic Party. The leader and founder of this new party was Thomas Jefferson.

This Democratic wave spread rapidly through the States. Opposition to the aristocratic principles of the Federalists, who were the Republicans of that day, increased. Hamilton wanted to make a great imperialistic nation of pomp and glory and pageantry and ceremony and paraphernalia and titles, and regalia. But the wave of opposition grew and spread, until by 1800 it had engulfed and completely annihilated the Federalist Party. It was as dead as a door nail and Thomas Jefferson was in the saddle.

Yes, sir; Thomas Jefferson, the champion of the Democratic cause, was at the helm of the ship of state. He came from one of the first families of Virginia. Wealthy and blue-blooded—an aristocrat by birth, but a Democrat by choice. He wrote the Declaration of Independence, which is the charter of the Democratic Party and the first public document of the Democratic movement.

Thomas Jefferson was the indirect author of the first 10 amendments, the Bill of Rights, the 10 torches of liberty.

Thomas Jefferson alone and single-handed destroyed the ancient law of primogenitor, which gave to the first born male all of the inheritance. "Give me one reason," said Jefferson, "why the first-born male child should have any more of the inheritance than the other children." And that one reason has not been given to this day. Jefferson, therefore, destroyed in this country that undemocratic law of primogenitor.

Hamilton would make the Union great and glorious, but Jefferson would make every citizen strong and free. Education hitherto was only for the rich, but Jefferson established the University of Virginia, the first State institution of its kind. He placed the jam and cookies on the lower shelf so every person could reach them, regardless of whether he was rich or poor.

These are the things that Jefferson stood for. These are the same principles that the same Democratic Party stands for today. And when I get to thinking of the virtue of these great doctrines, I feel like the mouse in the cellar. There was a keg of well-seasoned rye whisky, a little of it was dripping from the spigot. The mouse caught a few of these drops and then backed up against the keg and said, "Now bring on that ol' cat!"

When I dip into the fountain of democracy and drink anew from its inspiring stream I can back up against those principles and say, "Now bring on that old wolf of Wall Street, for who is afraid of the big, bad wolf!"

Then as the new Nation developed there came the era of good feeling, and the once dead Federalist or Republican Party began to show signs of life again. Gradually it revived. There grew up a clamor for more parade in government. Thus the Republicans regained control of the Government and began to use its power for special privileges. The commercial and industrial interests began to ask for laws favorable to them.

But a man came out of the West—it was the West then—a pioneer, as hard as the hickory with which he grew, a representative of "the plain people." Andrew Jackson, the lion of democracy, was in the saddle, and,—excuse the slang—but what I mean, he was in the saddle.

He spurred them in the shoulder, he spurred them in the flank, he rouled them on the ribs, and he whipped them over the head with the bridle. He turned those fat-handed, chronic, perpetual officeholders out by the droves; he cleaned the White House from attic to basement. He cleaned the Capitol from floor page to gallery loafer; and he went out among the pioneers and the plain common people, and he collected a bunch of the hornyhanded old Democrat boys and turned them in on the clover. He turned out the blue blood and turned in the red bloods. He decreased the economic advantage of the New England merchants and

increased the chances of the southern and western farmers and traders and trappers and woodcutters.

Jackson didn't wait for opportunities; he made them. He made them! At New Orleans he did not sit down and wring his hands and say, "This is a psychological situation. If I only had a good steel breastwork, I could meet the enemy." He built a breastwork of cotton bales and, in one of the bloodiest battles ever fought in history, defeated General Packingham, who outnumbered him 3 to 1.

With Jackson we see the second demise of the now Republican Party. Again it was as dead as a doornail. Were that party built upon principles as eternal as those that underlie the Democratic faith, it would not have so many funerals.

Pardon me, friends, if I seem to lean toward the Democratic faith; you see, my father's name was Thomas Jefferson Lee; my name is Joshua Bryan Lee.

I was rocked in a Democratic cradle,
I was fed on Democratic food,
I was spanked with a Democratic paddle,
And raised in a Democratic brood.

So please make allowance for my bursts of enthusiasm. Those truths that underlie the Democratic Party are eternal.

What has this party done? I can only hit the high spots. The following territories have been added to the Unted States under Democratic administrations:

The Louisiana Purchase was made by Jefferson in 1803. Florida purchased in 1819. Texas annexation in 1845. Oregon Treaty in 1846. Mexican cession in 1848. Gadsden Purchase in 1853.

The Louisiana Purchase was of far-reaching importance. It was prompted purely by a democratic motive. Spain had control of the lower Mississippi River and collected high tolls from the farmers and fur traders of the Missouri River Basin. Spain wanted to purchase this land from Napoleon to complete her control of the river. The merchants of the East opposed the United States purchase of this territory, because, first, it would anger Spain and they would lose much of her trade; and, second, if Spain closed the Mississippi to the farmers and fur traders of the basin, they would be forced to send their produce through the eastern markets. Therefore, the Democratic administration cast the ballot in favor of the pioneer and the farmer. Jefferson, by the Louisiana Purchase, kept the river for the United States and made possible our western expansion.

The following are the States that have been carved altogether or in part from land acquired under the Democratic administrations:

Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, Minnesota, Iowa, Wyoming, Colorado, Oklahoma, Kansas, Florida, Missouri, Arkansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, California, Nevada, Arizona, New Mexico, Texas, Washington, and Oregon.

The States that have been admitted under the Democratic administrations are:

	Year
Ohio	1803
Indiana	1816
Mississippi	1817
Illinois	1818
Alabama	1819
Maine	1820
Michigan	1837
Iowa	1846
Wisconsin	1848
Utah	1896

The Republican Party comes to life only in periods of peace and prosperity; but when there is a national crisis to meet, the people turn to the party of Jefferson and Jackson.

When foreign nations threatened to gain footing on the American Continent it was a Democratic President who announced the bold and daring Monroe Doctrine under whose sheltering protection the Latin American Republics have grown free and prosperous.

When foreign nations were destroying our marine commerce it was a Democratic administration that waged and won the War of 1812.

It was a Democratic administration that fought the Blackhawk War.

It was a Democratic administration that reached a long arm across the ocean and hacked the steel from the mailed fist of Germany and offered open-handed justice to the world.

And, finally, in this depression, the greatest crisis of all, the people have turned once again to the Democratic Party.

Do you remember those last hectic days under Mr. Hoover? Now Mr. Hoover comes out of the storm cellar in his new book and says there wasn't any storm. Do you remember those last 3 months under his administration? The soup lines lengthened. Communism was knocking at our door; foreclosures on every hand. There were food riots. The feet of the unemployed wore down the grass in our public parks. The wolf of hunger crouched at a million doors.

One morning you picked up the paper and read where the banks in Arkansas closed. Next the banks in California went; and Minnesota followed with her bank holiday. Then Ohio closed, then Michigan, then New York. People stood around on the street corners and whispered to each other: "What is going to happen to our Government? Is our Constitution going to stand? Will our Government endure?" Joseph Stalin, in Russia, laughed up his sleeve. Adolf Hitler, in Germany, pointed to the United States as an example of the failure of Democratic government.

But in that critical hour there arose a clarion voice calling the people to a crusade, a crusade against selfishness; a crusade for "the forgotten man", a crusade for human rights above property rights. That means but one person, that spells but one name: Roosevelt!

The same democratic spirit with the same lion-hearted leadership is typified by Roosevelt in his crusade for "the forgotten man" that was expressed by Jackson in his fight for "the plain people." No matter whether that leadership has come from the hermitage of Tennessee, or from Hyde Park of New York, it has been motivated by the one purpose of returning this Government to the people who ordained and established its Constitution.

COMMUNISTIC PROPAGANDA

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, for several years we have witnessed the efforts of patriotic Americans to end the dissemination of subversive, communistic propaganda. Many of the earnest men and women who engaged in this fine work did not find it easy to carry on amid the cynical attitudes of those who derided the possible dangers which could be seen only by those familiar with the situation.

However, in the course of the past 3 or 4 years, investigations conducted by the House and various other inquiries have established the fact that there exists real danger in these activities.

It has been proven that undesirable aliens not only foment strikes and disorder, but also deprive native-born citizens of employment. And the outrages committed against our American institutions both by words and deeds leave no doubt that drastic action is necessary and cannot longer be delayed.

The chief offender, as a body, is the Communist Party.

The evidence is in. Indictments on several counts have been returned. All that remains to be done is the pronouncement of sentence upon the culprit—this enemy of our organized society under our cherished and free democratic government.

The Communist Party in the United States is not a national political party in the sense that it strives to bring about changed conditions for the common man. Rather, this party enters a national ticket for the sole purpose of publicizing their group and bringing together the various malcontents and unbalanced minds which, unfortunately, are present everywhere.

The 25,000 enrolled members of the Communist International cannot by any stretch of the imagination be compared with the established party organizations maintained by the other political groups which participate in orderly elections in this country. Peaceful debate based upon intelligent principles is not to be found anywhere in their literature. Force, violence, and bloodshed are their watchwords.

Now, Mr. Speaker, no man is more concerned than I with the sanctity of our Constitution and the laws which have been established thereunder. It has been and is now contended that there is danger of violating the free-speech clause of the first amendment to the Constitution when we enact legislation to prevent the advocacy of the overthrow of our Government by force or the teaching of communistic doctrine in our schools. Those who make such contentions are no doubt correct; but there is nowhere any justification for failing to make mandatory the deportation of alien criminals. As a matter of fact, we already have, as you well know, in the act of June 5, 1920, sufficient legislative power to deport undesirable alien Communists. And here we come upon a singular situation, which I almost hesitate to point out. This situation involves the following purported facts:

First. The center of communistic agitation in New York City, where permits for parades and demonstrations are obtained with ease. At the call of their leaders, thousands of reds can be assembled in Union Square within a few hours. Plans hatched here are executed in the fruit-growing centers of California and the mines of Alabama; among the dock workers of San Francisco and in the cotton fields of the South. If the gathering of Communists in other great metropolitan centers is as nothing compared to New York, why cannot this foremost city of the world—and of which we are

all proud—why cannot this city also keep these exhibitionists from parading themselves before gullible workers?

Second. Is there any significance in the fact that our admirable and otherwise efficient Secretary of Labor comes to us from the great State of New York? I hope not, for if the two facts here recited can be said to be linked together, then the greatest responsibility for un-American activities in the United States may be laid at the threshold of New York City.

I am not attempting to impugn the honor and integrity of either the State or the city of New York; nor am I seeking to embarrass the Secretary of Labor. However, do you not feel that those Members of this House who are perturbed over the rapidly increasing growth of communism should have an explanation from some responsible source as to why the Department of Labor has been so lax in enforcing the laws regarding aliens?

It has been claimed that there are at least several thousands of aliens illegally in the United States. In this connection I wish to call attention to the open letter recently addressed to the President of the United States by an organizaion known as the "American Coalition." Expecting that an excess of patriotic zeal prompted many of the allegations contained in this letter, I have made a cursory inquiry to determine the truth. Unfortunately, I am compelled to admit that, as far as I have gone, I have encountered no reason to doubt the contents of this letter. This is a very serious matter, Mr. Speaker, and I do not believe I am unreasonable in reiterating that this House should have an explanation as to why the immigration laws have not been better administered. I would not like to find it necessary to formally investigate the administration of the Labor Department. I would rather go on record as being willing to receive any explanation which might be made and to place it before the House.

Several bills have been introduced providing for the deportation of undesirable aliens and to make it a crime to advocate or promote the overthrow of government by force. I feel that such legislation is imperative and most certainly will support the proper measure when it is presented for action. In the meantime, however, let us learn, if we can, what is being done to enforce similar laws already on the statutes.

CONFERENCE OF NEW MEMBERS WITH PRESIDENT URGED

Mr. HOEPPEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter which I addressed to the President on March 5 last.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOEPPEL. Mr. Speaker and Members, on the various occasions on which I have met our President, I have been favorably impressed with his sincerity and honesty of purpose. As I am more interested in national recovery than I am in party politics, and as it is further my sincere belief that our most practical hope for the alleviation or elimination of the distress of our people lies with the President, I addressed a letter to him with a view to cooperating with him along the lines of what I believe to be the "voice of the people."

Without in any way criticizing the older Members of Congress, nevertheless, it is self-evident that new Members may be expected to have a more intimate and personal understanding of the problems of the people whom it is their honor to represent in the National Capitol. Fully cognizant as I am of the high character and sincerity of purpose of the more experienced Members of the House of Representatives, with whom I feel that it is a privilege to be associated, at the same time I feel that the "young blood" of the House also has a very definite contribution to make to the solution of the problems of our people. It was this conviction which prompted me to address the letter to the President, which I herewith insert in the RECORD.

For the information of the Membership, it may be well to remark that this letter was addressed to the President prior to the call which was made assembling certain Members of Congress to a conference to discuss liberalization of House rules and the enactment of liberal legislation:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., March 5, 1935.

His Excellency the PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: In the parlance of the advertiser—even a man's best friends will not tell him. It would appear that your immediate advisers are either ignorant of the actual status of affairs or that they are reluctant to give you the facts which, as our Chief Executive, I think you should know since I am confident that you are amenable to criticism as well as to just praise, whenever such is merited.

Since my return to the Capital, I have received only three letters out of my huge mail wherein the correspondents spoke favorably of the administration. Two of these were from Democratic politicians who were looking for jobs, and the other, from a Republican who supported your views against the McCarran amendment. All other mail has been of an extremely critical nature and some, especially condemnatory, which indicates beyond a question of doubt that the people are beginning to lose confidence in your administration and in the Congress.

There are a large number of Representatives in the House who are more friendly to you and more concerned in the welfare of the Nation than their votes and activities would perhaps indicate. The newer Members of Congress, especially from the Western and Northern States, who had a battle to be elected or reelected, could give you a panoramic picture of conditions and the recent developments which would prove that you may profit if you would consult with them.

I am anxious to see your administration a success, but my correspondence from outstanding leaders and thinking men would indicate that the new deal must be lubricated with a different kind of lubricant if it is to move forward successfully. Those of us who represent the uncertain political sections of the Nation, and who, because of our brief experience as Representatives, have not as yet absorbed the veneer of indifference to the public interest, may be in a position, if called upon, to give constructive criticism which would react in your own interest as well as that of national recovery.

If you are inclined to receive a delegation of 15 or 25 of the newer Members of Congress, to obtain from them their viewpoints on the progress thus far attained and the prospects for the future, I would be pleased to suggest a list of names of such Members who wish to cooperate with you to the fullest possible extent, but who are sacrificing their own interests if they permit conditions to develop which only radical measures may counteract.

This is submitted in your interest and in the interest of our people in the hope of alleviating, as expeditiously as possible, the increasing distress which evokes the reversal of sentiment which not only I but other Members of Congress report.

I shall be pleased to cooperate with you in the furtherance of the above suggestions at any time.

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely yours,

J. H. HOEPPEL.

EUGENE G. GRACE—SUPERPATRIOT, OR WHAT?

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Speaker, the attitude of Eugene G. Grace, as reflected by his statements before the Senate Munitions Committee, is more dangerous to this Nation than is all of the communistic propaganda emanating from Soviet Russia. In one breath he upheld the privilege of him and his class to extract from his nation in time of war excessive profits with which to pay ridiculously large bonuses and fat dividends; but he objected to the men who were in the danger zone asking for the one three-thousandth part of what he received. It is all too indicative of his class in their attitude toward the welfare of the Nation; whenever any of whom they regard as the proletariat expresses the desire to better his condition by fair wages, reasonable working hours, safety appliances, better living conditions, or economic security it is the "let them eat cake" attitude of the nobility of France preceding the French Revolution.

Mr. Grace is undoubtedly an able captain of industry; but evidently is a poor judge of our present national psychology. The hopes and desires of mankind cannot be forever melted in the crucible of necessity and cast in the mold of unequal distribution of profits. Pig iron and human nature are not analogous. The determination of mankind to advance is irresistible. It is like the progress of a mighty river, and although it may be temporarily held in check will eventually break forth and reach its destination. When those of the type of Mr. Grace oppose such movements as the one to take the profits out of war they only attract attention to their own provincialism which, after all, is woe-

fully limited. The Nation to him is bounded by the fences of the Bethlehem Steel Works along the Lehigh River, guarded by his private police force. Here he is king, and every human consideration is secondary to the making of steel.

Such monarchs as Mr. Grace are ever beseeching Congress for a tariff on their products under the plea that they desire to protect the American workingman from the cheap labor from abroad. What a plea, when they are the very ones who have been the most active in importing cheap foreign labor to compete with American labor in its own dooryard. With industries organized upon such a magnificent scale as ours, with our domestic supply of raw material and splendid fuel, with our network of transportation lines, with the undisputed higher standard of skill and ingenuity of our workmen American industry could easily compete with foreign industry if it were not forced to pay dividends on watered stock, outrageous salaries and bonuses to active officials, and ridiculous pensions to retired officials. What a class of people to complain of a bonus to men who have made "their breasts a barricade between their country and its foes."

WE MUST PROTECT THE LITTLE FARMER

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein some statistics from the Agricultural Department.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, how much of the RECORD is going to be taken up by the statistics of the Agricultural Department?

Mr. SNYDER. About 4 or 5 inches of a single column.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, in the early part of the seventeenth century our forefathers started the agricultural and industrial development march westward across our continent. The first obstacle to overcome was that of the Indians. The second was the task of clearing off sufficient acreage for farm land on which they could raise the food products necessary for a comfortable living.

Year after year the frontier moved westward until, we might say, 1849, when the gold rush to California brought about conditions that prompted men to improve transportation, take up land grants and mineral rights in such a rapid fashion that when the nineteenth century opened our lands were practically all surveyed and available for development.

Forty or fifty years ago the great fertile fields of the Middle West produced such an abundance of corn, wheat, hay, and other major crops that it astounded the Eastern farmers. One by one the more ambitious individuals interested in farming would go West and secure acreage for homes and farms not only in the Middle West, but the great Northwest and the Southeast.

From this came a development of farm machinery, mining machinery, and lumber machinery, and when the call for a superabundance of production came with the World War we were in a position not only to furnish farm products, but equipment of all kinds that was used both at home and abroad in the great world struggle.

Mills and factories sprung up as if my magic. Coal mines, ore mines, zinc mines, copper mines, and all other mineral developments were pushed to the limit.

After the war we had a relapse of 1921, and, due to the fact that we had depleted our home storehouses very largely during the war period and the war had destroyed mills and factories of many of the European countries, we found a ready market for 6 or 7 years in furnishing food products as well as manufactured products for the rehabilitation of the institutions in the war-stricken nations. Of course, the sad part of the story is, that during the fat years 1922 to 1929, our economic and social institutions were so badly managed that when the inevitable came, the crash of 1929, our institutions were not able to function.

The fall of the Roman Empire did not have the ill effects on the people of Rome as the financial and economic crash in the United States had on our people in 1929. The financial institutions of our Nation were operating on a quicksand basis, and when they were supposed to stand up and give relief to our institutions they tottered and fell, taking with them multiplied billions of dollars that the people thought was safely stored away for the rainy days ahead.

During these fat years the people flocked from the little farms and homes to the mills and factories where high wages attracted them. They were led to believe that this production period would not only continue but expand as time went on. They were not acquainted with the facts. They did not know that we had loaned foreign countries millions to buy our products to rehabilitate their countries and that this loan would not be paid when it fell due by many of the nations who borrowed from us. The result was that the mills and factories were obliged to close down. There was no demand for our products. Men by the tens of thousands were thrown out of employment, and a large percent of them are still unemployed.

We failed to keep alive in the minds of our citizens that the only creative wealth of a nation is the wealth that comes from the ground—agricultural wealth.

I fear that our schools let down in teaching the youth of the land that a nation is only prosperous in proportion as the farmers of the Nation are prosperous. I sometimes think that we fail to keep before the mental gaze of the youth of our Nation the fundamental fact that the tillers of the soil are the bulwark of a nation at all times. Furthermore, that nations decay when industry overtaxes and domineers the agricultural interests of the people.

Mr. Speaker, in making appropriations for the several phases of agriculture we must bear in mind that the first thing to consider is the time period ahead. We must not only build so that our agricultural resources will take care of us in the immediate future, but that our building may expand in such a way that future generations will have agricultural facilities commensurate with the demands and needs of the day in which they live.

We cannot hope to hand down to our posterity agricultural facilities unless we immediately start on a broad and comprehensive program of developing our watersheds and forests. It is our duty right now, Mr. Speaker, to improve streams and build hundreds of dams and watersheds throughout the Nation. It is our duty to plant millions and millions of trees on the hillsides and slopes of our Nation in order that moisture may be stored to take care of dry seasons. Mr. Speaker, we see the folly of the plans and procedures of farming as it has been carried on in the Middle West for the last 50 years. It is now evident that the procedure was to get while the getting was good. Get everything from the soil and give nothing in return to the soil. That was the practice of 50 years. What is the result?

The drought in the Middle States was brought about largely because we did not protect our streams and plant trees. If the States of the Nation had been provided with sufficient watersheds and at appropriate places in these States millions of trees had been planted, there would have been no drought last summer in that once great fertile region.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I am reminded of the "pumper" from California who was storm stayed in a Quaker town in Pennsylvania one Saturday night. The next morning he went to the only church in the town, which happened to be a Quaker church. After a period of time the spokesman in this church arose and said, "Brethren, none of you seem to be moved by the Spirit this morning, so we will return to our homes." At this point the "pumper" from California jumped up and said, "Mr. Leader, if nobody has anything to say about the Spirit, I would like to put in a good word for California."

At this place I want to put in a word for Pennsylvania, my native State, along the line of agriculture. My fellow colleagues mean well, I am sure, but ofttimes one would judge from the remarks and debates that Pennsylvania was not

included among the great agricultural States of the Nation. Thus I ask the privilege of inserting at this point some data and statistics with reference to the major agricultural products of the Nation, comparing Pennsylvania with the other States in the production of the several farm and commodity products here enumerated.

Potatoes

State	Acreage harvested (1,000 acres)			Yield per acre (bushels)			Production (1,000 bushels)			Prices received by farmers, Dec. 1 (per bushel)			Total value basis, Dec. 1 price (1,000 dollars)		
	1932	1933	1934	1932	1933	1934	1932	1933	1934	1932	1933	1934	1932	1933	1934
Maine	170	150	168	238	280	335	40,460	42,000	56,280	$0.25	$0.60	$0.20	10,115	25,200	11,256
New York	210	200	210	135	123	155	28,350	24,600	32,550	.37	.75	.34	10,490	18,450	11,067
Michigan	260	265	268	115	78	128	29,900	20,670	34,304	.23	.65	.28	6,877	13,436	9,605
Wisconsin	260	239	261	87	70	120	22,620	16,730	31,320	.23	.55	.29	5,203	9,202	9,083
Idaho	99	95	104	200	230	185	19,800	21,850	19,240	.17	.41	.36	3,366	8,958	6,926
Pennsylvania	195	189	200	110	113	170	21,450	21,357	34,000	.45	.90	.41	9,652	19,221	13,940
Tennessee	51	54	60	69	66	72	3,519	3,564	4,320	.59	1.01	.76	2,076	3,600	3,283
South Carolina	17	16	21	85	109	125	1,445	1,744	2,625	.75	.78	.62	1,084	1,360	1,628

Pennsylvania production

	1932	1933	1934	Rank
Corn (92,200,000 bushels):				
Average price (per bushel)	$0.41	$0.52	$0.77	Ninth.
Value	19,000,000	26,000,000	40,000,000	
Rye (1,344,000 bushels):				
Average price (per bushel)	.44	.67	.75	Seventh.
Value	682,000	1,076,000	1,800,000	
Buckwheat (3,105,000 bushels):				
Average price (per bushel)	.39	.49	.52	First.
Value	983,000	1,347,000	1,934,000	
Hay (2,569,000 tons):				
Average price (per ton)	9.49	10.49	15.49	Fourth.
Value	24,800,000	32,672,000	39,785,000	
Oats (34,915,000 bushels):				
Average price (per bushel)	.28	.39	.52	Seventh.
Value	6,740,000	8,117,000	12,956,000	
Wheat (14,000,000 bushels):				
Average price (per bushel)	.52	.81	.92	Eleventh.
Value	7,600,000	12,784,000	13,582,000	

Mr. Speaker, Pennsylvania contributes to the National Treasury more money than any other one of the 48 States of the Union, except New York. It is only natural that those outside of the State think of Pennsylvania as industrial, a place where they produce iron and steel products; but Pennsylvania takes her place among the first States in the Union in the production of a number of the major crops.

The Department of Agriculture just informed me where Pennsylvania ranks in the production of a number of the major crops, and since I have cited the above seven crops with the purpose of showing Pennsylvania's production, I will use the same seven crops as a basis of rank:

In States producing potatoes Pennsylvania ranked first on a basis of dollar value and third in the number of bushels produced as indicated above.

In States producing buckwheat Pennsylvania ranked first.

In States producing corn Pennsylvania ranked ninth.

In States producing rye Pennsylvania ranked seventh.

In States producing hay Pennsylvania ranked fourth.

In States producing wheat Pennsylvania ranked eleventh.

In States producing oats Pennsylvania ranked seventh.

The above table will show how absurd it is for the opponents of collective bargaining to say that the N. R. A. has caused Southern States like Tennessee to plow down their acreage for potatoes and thus crowd the northern market.

For instance, look at the potato production of Tennessee for the last 3 years. Few more bushels were grown in the entire State than was grown in one of my counties, Somerset County, Pennsylvania. Furthermore, the Department of Agriculture informs us that not one single carload of Tennessee potatoes in 1933, 1934, or 1935 was unloaded in Pennsylvania.

Mr. Speaker, it will be observed that the price of potatoes during the last 3 years in the several States enumerated fluctuated—1933 being the peak year of the 3 years. Of course, that is nothing unusual. When potatoes reached the price they did in 1933, the Department of Agriculture shows that potato growers increased their acreage and thus put on the market for 1934 many more millions of bushels. Now, those who are not favorable to the Agricultural Adjustment Act, naturally are satisfied with the prices as they come and go. They have no complaint to make if potatoes are 20 cents one day and 60 cents the next, because they hold that the law of supply and demand should govern the price. On the other hand, those who believe that there should be a minimum and maximum of stability in prices in the various crops favor the crop production act. It is as self-evident as night follows day, that if the present procedure is dropped, the little farmers in the East, such as Pennsylvania, will go back just where they were in 1932 when wheat was selling for 52 cents per bushel as compared with 92 cents per bushel this year.

Of course adjustments in farm-crop production cannot be set aright in a year or two. It will take time—a space of years. All progressive farmers concede that conditions that existed in 1931 and 1932 should not be permitted to return. Little by little the Agriculture Department is adjusting this phase in favor of the small farmer, and if given time the small farmer will be restored to a place where he will be on a par with the large producers, and the cutthroat practices will be eliminated.

ANDREW JACKSON

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend in the RECORD an address delivered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS] on Andrew Jackson.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to insert an address delivered by Hon. J. P. RICHARDS, Member of Congress, on March 15, 1935, the birthday of Andrew Jackson, at the memorial exercises held at the Andrew Jackson Monument, Washington, D. C., sponsored by the Women's Democratic Educational Council.

The address is as follows:

Madam president, members of the Women's Democratic Educational Council, distinguished guests, I appreciate very much the invitation you have extended me to be present here today and to deliver this memorial address in honor of the birthday of Andrew Jackson, great Democrat, great American, and seventh President of the United States. You have selected the appropriate place for this occasion—here within a stone's throw of the White House, where he lived and labored as President for a number of years—here in the shadows of the great bronze monument erected to his memory by a grateful Nation.

Long ago the earlier civilizations of this planet adopted the custom, and found it to be a worth-while investment in the development of a better citizenship to erect monuments and memorials to departed great men who had lived and wrought for the lasting benefit of the people whom they left behind. The people of Rome built monuments to her Emperors, and to her lawmakers who had thundered in the Roman Senate. The Egyptians built the pyramids to protect the dead bodies of her Kings. Greece perpetuated the memory of her patriots by likenesses of beautiful marble. The people of our own civilization also believe in this custom, and today monuments to illustrious departed sons, who helped to mold these United States, dot every square of this, the Capital of our country, as they dot the gathering places in our other cities and towns.

But, Madam President, the greatest monument built to any man is the reservation of a place in the hearts of a people in memory of the works he has done. Stone or marble or bronze may not stand forever, but a place in the hearts of men and women lingers for unnumbered generations and will never perish.

So we have come to the foot of this monument today, at the request of this patriotic band of Democratic women, honored by the presence of one of Andrew Jackson's distinguished relatives, not only to gaze upon the likeness of this great Democrat, whose soul was returned 90 years ago to the God who gave it, but also to proclaim to the men and women of our country our reverence for his memory and the political principles he stood for and fought for with the flaming sword of conscientious conviction.

This man Andrew Jackson, "who came from nowhere, determined to be somebody", how did he stamp his personality upon a nation? By what means did he breathe life into a great slumbering political party? Why is his memory ever present everywhere in this country where battle is being waged for the rights of the masses of our people today? Where was he first nursed on the milk of love for liberty?

The life and achievements of this man stagger the imagination and lend hope to every obscure lad today facing poverty, adversity, and seemingly insurmountable obstacles. His father, a poor Irish immigrant, came to this country in 1765 and settled in the Waxhaw's old Lancaster district, now Lancaster County, S. C., and died a few months before his great son's birth at the Crawford place in Lancaster County on March 15, 1767. His bones still rest in the old Waxhaw cemetery a few miles north of the town of Lancaster. Andrew Jackson's mother died during his early youth. Faced with almost every known hardship he was able to attend school very little in his boyhood. His earliest impressions were received in the fiery crucible of the Revolution, and this period branded patriotism and love of freedom on his heart. He, himself, took part in battle at the age of 11, and even so early his spirit would admit no defeat. Ambitious to be a lawyer, but without education, he was undismayed, and after moving to North Carolina was admitted to the bar of that State. Then, sensing the possibilities of the frontier, he moved to what is now the State of Tennessee and established a law office at the present site of the city of Nashville. From then on his rise was meteoric. He was solicitor of the superior court, member of the first constitutional convention of Tennessee, Member of Congress, then United States Senator, which position he resigned to sit on the Supreme Court of Tennessee; planter, trader, and merchant, major general of militia, Indian fighter, and duelist, victor over the British at New Orleans in the War of 1812, conqueror of the Indians at Horse Shoe Bend, conqueror and territorial governor of Florida; nominated by the Democrats for the Presidency in 1822, sent again to the Senate 1823, nominated again for President by the Democratic Party and elected President in 1828 and served two terms; always during the entire period of his political activity he was a flashing meteor across the horizon of his country.

His career covered amazingly one-third of the States of the Union, and everywhere, always, he was a man of action. As a general, he was unversed in the written art of war, but a genius in the leadership of men. While unfamiliar with the culture of superficial society, still he was a master of the graces when he chose. His love for his wife was beautiful, and he was the soul of chivalry in his dealings with all of the gentler sex. A diamond, admittedly unpolished by our so-called "civilization", but also uncorrupted by its glamour.

Andrew Jackson was a loyal friend but a bitter enemy. Such a man is always great or ignoble in the eyes of his contemporaries. It is admitted here that he erred time and time again, but never did he indicate weakness of character. But we, who have gathered here today in his memory, have come to review his works over the smoldering ashes of almost a century. Providence brought him to the Nation at a critical time. Our country then was torn within. Then, as now, the fight was the masses against special interests. Jackson grasped the flaming banner of democracy and coined the phrase that has been the battle cry of democracy since that time—"Let the people rule." Protection of the rights of the whole people was his aim to the point of obsession; yet he was one of those strong characters often seen in the van of world events, who, while demanding and obtaining consideration of his own personal views by those over him in authority, still could understand and brook no opposition to his own opinions when he himself was the commanding officer—a strange inconsistency we often find in the lives of the great.

The enemies of Jackson say that he practiced in politics the "spoils system", and attempt to damn him for this as the most vulnerable spot in his armor. This determination of Jackson to have around him in office only those of his own political party was more than a mere desire to reward friends; it was because of an abiding belief that real loyalty in politics, or elsewhere, can come only from friends. He knew that to carry out his policies he must have the faithful around him and he believed that one traitor in his own camp is more dangerous than a thousand without. Could we expect otherwise of a man who was nursed in the cradle of the Revolutionary War, where every man in his eyes was a patriot or a traitor; of a man who had battled against the Indians, where the combatants in his eyes were either civilized or savage; of a man who had faced all the hardships of the frontier and found men of that day, as now, either true or false? After all, who is there among us here today who does not believe in rewarding a friend before an enemy; who of us would not select a Democrat to carry our Democratic principles in preference to someone of another political faith?

The Democratic Party has ever been the party of the real people of this country. There have been times when because of overdoses of prosperity we have been lulled to sleep; but, in times when the welfare of our people have been at stake, it has been to our great old party that the people turned for relief; and on such occasions a Democrat has, with possibly one or two exceptions, been placed in the White House. The names of Jefferson, Jackson, Wilson, and now Franklin D. Roosevelt challenge comparison with the names of the great from any other political faith. They came from divergent stations and walks of life but came with eyes set to the same goal—a happier and more prosperous people.

As I stand here today, I let my mind's eye go back for over a century and a half to the lonely Waxhaw country in the red hills of my home county and State. I see a lonely, hungry, homely country boy, without one single favorable advantage except courage and ambition and an abiding faith in the future of his country—I see him leave his home and blaze a path to fame—I see him enter the doors yonder as President of the United States. I see him leave those walls and go back to his home in Tennessee to die enshrined in the hearts of his people—a great reward for courage and honesty, and a tribute to the possibilities for youth in this great country of ours.

Another great Democratic President is over there in the White House now. He did not come from poverty as Andrew Jackson did, but he has the same unquenchable desire to help all of the people of our country. Sometimes when he is wearied by toil and the responsibilities of his great office, or, perchance, discouraged by setbacks of the day, I can imagine his looking across the way to the old warrior, sitting his charger here, for a comforting word; and I can almost hear Jackson whisper: "Fight it out. Have faith in democracy. Listen to your real friends. Let the people rule!"

PAYMENT OF THE ADJUSTED-SERVICE CERTIFICATES

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, the Legislature of the State of Idaho has memorialized the Congress in respect to the payment of the adjusted-service certificates. I ask unanimous consent that the memorial referred to appear in the RECORD and that it appear in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. During the present session of Congress I think we have fallen into a very bad practice of inserting in the body of the RECORD resolutions and memorials from States and city councils, and so forth. I observed in the RECORD the other day a resolution or memorial from even a city council.

The universal practice heretofore has been merely to file these resolutions from States and legislative bodies, together with other petitions or memorials, and they are noted in the Appendix of the daily RECORD, but not printed in full. That has, I believe, been the invariable practice.

Mr. SNELL. And that is correct, too.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I feel quite sure that the practice of incorporating in the body of the RECORD petitions and memorials and what not from States and boards of aldermen throughout the Nation is a practice that has grown up in this session of Congress.

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

Mr. O'CONNOR. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. There are 48 States whose legislatures are continually passing resolutions. It so happens that in the Legislature of the State of Texas, I think our State senate, has already passed half a dozen resolutions which they have sent up here to the Texas Members of Congress. Suppose we printed all of them in the RECORD and then printed a like number from all of the other 47 States. If we are going to continue to put them into the body of the RECORD, it will cost a lot of money, and we will not have any place for the regular proceedings of the House.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Further, the great State of Wisconsin the other day wrote to both branches of Congress and asked if these petitions or memorials from the States addressed to Congress were of any worth, or had any influence. As far as I know that great State of Wisconsin received a reply that it might just as well save the expense of printing those memorials and resolutions. I think the practice which has grown up is objectionable and that it should not be permitted to continue. It is all right, perhaps, to refer to these memorials in the Appendix of the daily RECORD, as in this instance it could be properly noted that a memorial had been filed by the great sovereign State of Idaho.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object, to ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'CONNOR] if he expects to object to having this inserted in the RECORD at this point?

Mr. SABATH. If the gentleman does not, I shall.

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

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, the people of the great State of Idaho, represented by their legislature, and their Representatives here at the Capitol, desire this information to be conveyed to the Congress. I know of no better way of doing it than this.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, in order to expedite the business of the House, I object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho that these resolutions be printed in the Appendix of the daily RECORD?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr Speaker, in view of the importance of the legislation to be considered on the floor of this House within the next few days to provide for the immediate payment of the ex-service men's adjusted-compensation certificates, and that the Members of this body may know the sentiment of the people of the State of Idaho as expressed by their duly elected Representatives, I desire to place before the House a joint resolution of the Idaho State Legislature, urging Congress to pass this legislation.

STATE OF IDAHO,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

I, Franklin Girard, secretary of state of the State of Idaho and custodian of the seal of said State, do hereby certify:

That I have carefully compared the annexed copy of senate joint memorial no. 1 with the original thereof adopted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the extraordinary session of the Twenty-third Legislature of the State of Idaho and filed in the office of the secretary of state of the State of Idaho March 11, 1935, and that the same is a full, true, and complete transcript therefrom and of the whole thereof, together with all endorsements thereon.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State. Done at Boise, the capital of Idaho, this 12th day of March, A. D. 1935.

[SEAL] FRANKLIN GIRARD,
Secretary of State.

Senate Joint Memorial 1

(By Mr. Dow)

A joint memorial

To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

We, your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, respectfully represent:

Whereas there is now pending before the Congress of the United States a bill to provide for the full and immediate payment of the adjusted-service certificates with all interest and charges against them eliminated; and

Whereas, should this be enacted into law at the present time, it will alleviate suffering among thousands of needy ex-service men and will in a large measure restore confidence; and

Whereas it will throw into the channels of trade and commerce many millions of dollars: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Idaho (the house of representatives concurring), That we most respectfully urge upon the Congress of the United States of America early and favorable consideration of such legislation as will bring about the full and immediate payment of the adjusted-service certificates; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be authorized, and he is hereby directed, to immediately forward certified copies of this memorial to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America and to the Senators and the Representatives in Congress from this State.

This senate joint memorial passed the senate on the 9th day of March 1935.

G. P. MIX,
President of the Senate.

This senate joint memorial passed the house of representatives on the 9th day of March 1935.

TROY D. SMITH,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

I hereby certify that the within senate joint memorial no. 1 originated in the senate during the extraordinary session of the Twenty-third Legislature of the State of Idaho.

MORRIS STACY,
Secretary of the Senate.

PROBLEMS OF A NEW CONGRESSMAN

Mr. KVALE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by including therein an address delivered over the radio last night by my colleague from Texas [Mr. MAVERICK] on the subject of free speech.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KVALE. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address of Hon. MAURY MAVERICK, of Texas, March 17, 1935:

Fellow Americans, I am a new Congressman, so you'll forgive me for repeating my name just once, MAURY MAVERICK—last name M-A-V-E-R-I-C-K, MAVERICK. I hail from the great State of Texas and from the famous city of San Antonio, where stands the Alamo—you know about the Battle of the Alamo, where every man died in defense of liberty.

Let me tell you a little about being a new Congressman and how it feels. You see, there are a hundred and ten of us, mostly Democrats, but also Republicans, Progressives, and Farmer Laborites. About 1 in 4 of all the Members of the House of Representatives are new, and I consider it an honor to serve with such a group of fine men. Without respect to party, I consider these new men the best set of soldiers of the Republic that I have ever known.

Of course, we had a lot to learn, but we're learning fast and working hard, and I am not apologizing either for myself or for the group. We were sent here to represent our districts now; not 2 years from now, but right now. The situation that faces you and me in our daily lives, and our children—who ought to have some future—and our old people—who ought to have some security in their old age—is nothing less than desperate. Of course, things are getting better and at our noonday pompous luncheon clubs we still slap each other on the back and sing Ring around the Rosy, our chambers of commerce everywhere still boost our particular city as having the best water and scenery on earth, but you know and I know we are face to face with a great stone wall of truth and can't get around it.

Let me make a point which you already know, and that is the Government is not in Washington but where you hear this voice. Here in this room, your room, and others all over the Nation, the people of this country, why, there is your government. And you know if we here in Washington appropriate, say, a million dollars or a billion or so, we—that's you—pay it back plus interest from now to all eternity. What we must do is to find a way to solve this depression, to revive business, and put our people back to work.

But about the new Congressmen—after we were assigned our offices, we began to read our trunks and bales of correspondence, and soon we found we have the hardest jobs of our lives, must learn new rules of procedure, myriads of governmental questions, meet new people, learn the town, find out something about some several thousand bills that have already been introduced concerning every idea, panacea, and remedy on earth—and after a good 12 to 16 hours' work a day, we must find time to sleep a little.

On the first day of Congress I walked in and all the old Members were shaking hands; we freshmen walked in like scared rabbits and couldn't tell a new Member from an old, except that a new Member looked lonesome and an old Member looked happy. I never loved my home town of San Antonio, Tex., so much in all my life; I felt homesick; and I sort of wanted to be home and hear some of our American Mexicans sing El Rancho Grande—amigos de San Antonio salud!—but in a few days we could at least get in the door without being stopped as a wide-eyed tourist, and then we began to feel natural again.

Oh, fellow Americans, this is a grand and beautiful city, when we came it was snow-clad, but now the buds are coming out; and you'll have to give it to Mr. Roosevelt, he moved the Capitol away from his home town down here to Washington. You see, the Capitol was really up a little street in New York, but now it's on one end of Pennsylvania Avenue, in Washington, D. C., where it belongs. And I hope I can help in keeping the Capitol here in Washington, because the crowd up the little street in New York seem to make progress, occasionally, in taking the Government back away from us.

But old and new—Congressmen have plenty of work. And it has been pleasant here, because the old Members of Congress have been very kind to us; and if I have any idea of Congress at all, we came at the most critical time in history. In a time like this we must be calm and steadfast.

And the basic foundation of our country, the first amendment to the Constitution, is still more important than all the rest—listen. It says:

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances."

Now why is it important? The reason is that unless we preserve these rights we will never know the truth or have the right kind of Government. For the Lord said: "Ye shall know the truth and it will make thee free."

Remember also that free speech means free speech, and do not be deterred from protecting it in every way, including those whom you bitterly oppose. Don't let some big shot, or some poor fellow fed with lies or propaganda shout "radical" or "socialist" and stop you from listening or thinking. No label put on you can keep you from being a good American. Roosevelt needs men and women who use their own heads.

You should oppose all legislation which prevents the exercise of our constitutional liberties, because you cannot then protect yourself; without free speech there will be no intelligent education, no knowledge, and no progress.

Here's something important—read the President's message to Congress about the Power Trust and the holding companies. That

is by far the best State document our President has written at this term of Congress. Don't believe the propaganda of the Power Trust that anything is going to be confiscated by your Government. Do you think the Government would treat you like the Insull interests treated the people? This is a move in exactly the right direction. If you really want a copy, reviewing the whole power question, write to your own Congressman for a copy of the President's message.

And now, my friends, I'll have to leave you for the while. Remember two things: First, to preserve free speech and liberty for everybody—listen, think, and study; and, second, that the President is all right on the power issue, and needs the help of you people who use your own heads.

Good night to my people back home. Say! they tell me the bluebonnets are out, and the laurel and huisache are beautiful. And good night to everybody everywhere in the country.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask the attention of the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'CONNOR]. Is it the plan to call up the rule on the bonus matter tomorrow?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I am subject to the leadership of the House. I understand that is the plan.

Mr. SNELL. I am doing the gentleman the honor of taking it for granted that he is a part of the leadership of the House.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Oh, no; I am subject to the leadership, and if the leadership directs me to call up the rule tomorrow, I should be glad to do so.

Mr. SNELL. Can the gentleman say whether we may expect that rule to be called up tomorrow?

Mr. O'CONNOR. That is a reasonable expectation.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, my understanding is that the rules provide for 1 hour's debate upon the rule itself and 10 hours' debate upon the bill. It will be in order tomorrow, and I think nothing else will interfere with it.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. LUCKEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one-half minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUCKEY. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, the 19th of March, will the seventy-fifth anniversary of the birthday of William Jennings Bryan. I represent his district in Congress. I ask unanimous consent to address this House tomorrow for 10 minutes upon the life and character of William Jennings Bryan. [Applause.]

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

There was no objection.

STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND LABOR DEPARTMENTS APPROPRIATION BILL—1936

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I call up a conference report on the bill, H. R. 5255, making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice and for the judiciary, and for the Departments of Commerce and Labor, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, and for other purposes; and I ask unanimous consent that the statement may be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman calls up the conference report on the bill, H. R. 5255, and asks unanimous consent that the statement may be read in lieu of the report. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5255) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice and for the judiciary, and for the Departments of Commerce and Labor, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1933, 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 amendments numbered 26, 34, 35, 48, and 49.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 36, 38, 39, 41, 46, and 50, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$67,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 33: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "$25,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 37: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: ": *Provided further*, That this limitation shall not operate to reduce the compensation of any stenographer now employed nor shall the salary of any stenographer drawing more than $2,500 per annum hereafter be increased"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 40: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows: "the Air Commerce Act of 1926, as amended"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 42: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$758,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 43: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 43, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$671,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 44: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 44, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,802,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 45: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 45, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,600,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 47: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"Shellfish investigation: To provide for the investigation, control, and eradication of marine organisms injurious to shellfish in the Atlantic and Gulf States, including purchase of equipment and supplies, including boats and floating equipment and the maintenance and operation thereof; hire and charter of vessels and boats; pay of officers and crews and other personal services, including temporary employees (not exceeding $4,000 in the District of Columbia) as may be necessary, printing and binding, and all other necessary expenses connected therewith, $100,000, of which $50,000 shall be immediately available."

And the Senate agree to the same.

W. B. OLIVER,
THOS. S. MCMILLAN,
ROBERT L. BACON,
Managers on the part of the House.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL, Jr.,
KEY PITTMAN,
FREDERICK HALE,
GERALD P. NYE,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5255) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice and for the judiciary, and for the Departments of Commerce and Labor, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying report as to each of such amendments, namely:

Amendments nos. 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 36, 40, 41, 48, 49 are all clarifying amendments of a minor character. The House managers have concurred on all amendments except no. 48 and no. 49, upon which the Senate managers have receded.

On amendment no. 1: Appropriates $23,000, as proposed by the Senate, for publishing territorial papers of the United States, instead of $18,000, as proposed by the House.

On amendment no. 2: Appropriates $3,293,395 for salaries of Foreign Service officers, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $3,150,000, as provided by the House.

On amendments nos. 15, 16, 17, and 23: Restores to the bill $1,470, as proposed by the Senate. The effect of these three amendments is to permit the American member of the International Institute of Agriculture at Rome, Italy, to receive a salary of $7,500 per annum, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $6,000, as provided by the House.

On amendment no. 24: Appropriates $60,000, as provided by the Senate, for a survey to be made by the American section of the International Boundary Commission, United States and Mexico.

On amendment no. 25: Appropriates $67,000 for special surveys or investigations to be made by the International Joint Commission, instead of $52,000, as provided by the House, and $71,000, as proposed by the Senate. The effect of this amendment is to reduce the amount available for the so-called "sulphur fumes" investigation from $19,000, as proposed by the Senate, to $15,000.

On amendment no. 26: Appropriates $164,000 for the expenses of the General and Special Claims Convention, United States and Mexico, as proposed by the House, instead of $170,000, as provided by the Senate.

On amendment no. 33: Appropriates $25,000 for printing and binding in the Court of Claims, instead of $24,000, as proposed by the House, and $31,000, as provided by the Senate.

On amendment no. 34: Eliminates the allowances for living quarters and fuel, heat, and light for the officers and employees of the United States Court for China. The Senate amendment proposed to authorize these allowances, which had been eliminated by the House.

On amendment no. 35: Allows $40,000 for expenses of the United States Court for China, as proposed by the House, instead of $43,410, as approved by the Senate.

On amendment no. 37: Inserts the Senate amendment preventing the limitation on salaries of stenographers to circuit or district judges of the United States from operating to reduce the salary of any stenographer now employed, and further provides that no stenographer now drawing more than the $2,500 salary limitation shall hereafter be increased in salary.

On amendment no. 38: Inserts the Senate amendment permitting the appropriation for the Bureau of Air Commerce in the Department of Commerce to be used for investigation, research, and experimentation to develop and improve aids to aircraft, aircraft power plants, and accessories.

On amendment no. 39: Inserts the Senate amendment permitting the use of the appropriation for the Bureau of Air Commerce in the Department of Commerce to replace four airplanes instead of two, as provided by the House.

On amendment no. 42: Appropriates $758,000 for testing and inspection work of the Bureau of Standards, Department of Commerce, instead of $743,000, as proposed by the House, and $763,000, as approved by the Senate.

On amendment no. 43: Appropriates $671,500 for research and development work of the Bureau of Standards, Department of Commerce, instead of $656,500, as proposed by the House, and $676,500, as agreed to by the Senate.

On amendments no. 44 and 45: Corrects the total of appropriations for the Bureau of Standards to accord with action taken on amendments nos. 42 and 43.

On amendment no. 46: Appropriates $15,000 for enforcement of the black bass law, Bureau of Fisheries, Department of Commerce. This item was eliminated by the House and inserted in the Senate.

On amendment no. 47: Appropriates $100,000 for a shellfish investigation by the Bureau of Fisheries, Department of Commerce, of which amount $50,000 is made immediately available. The amendment of the Senate appropriated $250,000 and made $125,000 immediately available. The amendment as agreed to reduces the amount for personal services in the District of Columbia from $7,500 to $4,000.

On amendment no. 50: Increases the House limitation of $22,600 for allowances for living quarters, heat, fuel, and light, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Labor, to $36,000, as proposed by the Senate.

W. B. OLIVER,
THOS. S. MCMILLAN,
ROBERT L. BACON,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of the report; but pending that I will ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. BACON] if he desires any time?

Mr. BACON. I would like to have not more than 5 minutes to discuss two phases of this report just for the RECORD.

Mr. OLIVER. I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BACON].

Mr. BACON. Mr. Speaker, there are two phases of this conference report that I want to touch upon for the RECORD.

When the bill was before the House we brought to the attention of the House the fact that the Foreign Service of the United States, unless there was restoration of the cut made by the Budget, would be very adversely affected and would probably be on the road to disintegration. I am glad to say that the President reconsidered the proposal and sent a special message and a special budget recommendation to the Senate, and the approximate amount originally cut from the bill has been restored. I am informed by the State Department that this will permit of a new class coming in at the bottom by competitive examination. There has not been a competitive examination since 1931.

Mr. OLIVER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BACON. I yield.

Mr. OLIVER. I know the gentleman desires to be accurate, but the President did not reconsider. He had that in mind at the time the cut was made, and that statement was made to the House.

Mr. BACON. Yes. That is quite correct. I accept the correction of the gentleman from Alabama.

There is one other matter I want to touch upon, and that is the appropriation for the eradication of the pests that are now threatening the oyster industry from Maine to Texas. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND] brought in a bill authorizing $500,000. The Senate granted $250,000, and we have cut that estimate to $100,000. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in my present remarks at this point a break-down of how that money will be spent by the Bureau of Fisheries. This break-down was furnished me by the Bureau of Fisheries.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BACON]?

Mr. MCFARLANE. Reserving the right to object, what is the nature of the break-down?

Mr. BACON. This is an appropriation for the eradication of the pests that are destroying the oyster industry. Because of the fact that the matter never came before the Appropriations Committee of the House, and was inserted in the Senate, there being no hearings before the House Committee on Appropriations, it seems wise to inform the membership of the House who are interested, how that money is going to be spent.

Mr. MCFARLANE. I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to is as follows:

OYSTER-PEST CONTROL BY THE BUREAU OF FISHERIES

The production of oysters in the United States has fallen from one hundred and fifty to one hundred and sixty million pounds from 1912 to 1929 to 70,000,000 pounds in the last 3 years. The decrease was accompanied by a considerable reduction in price to the fishermen, so that the majority of them are in great economic distress. This situation has been aggravated further by an extraordinary abundance and spread of oyster enemies, chiefly the starfish, drill, and leach. The latter, for instance, has destroyed in less than 2 years approximately one million bushels of marketable oysters in Apalachicola Bay, Fla., and is now spreading to adjacent areas.

Because of the wide spread of the pests and their tendency to migrate from one place to another without regard to State boundaries, their eradication and control require a well-organized and unified campaign which the individual States are unable to undertake. The following project combines investigational activities with the practical measures of eradication. Investigation is especially urgent in case of the leech, the life history of which is not known. Although the presence of this organism on oyster beds was reported about 20 years ago, it has not been considered destructive to oysters until its recent outbreak in Florida.

The oystermen in New England and North Atlantic States have been fighting the starfish since the beginning of the oyster industry. During the last 5 years there has been a considerable increase in the abundance of this pest in northern waters, and thousands of bushels of oysters ready for the market were destroyed. The Bureau has made preliminary experiments with the use of various chemicals in combating the starfish, but the work was discontinued 3 years ago on account of lack of funds.

Further experimentation is necessary for developing a more efficient method of eradication than dredging or mopping which is now in use.

Several years ago, as a result of careful studies, the Bureau published two papers on the drill in which the methods of control were suggested. It is therefore necessary to carry on field experiments with the view of improving the effectiveness of the traps designed by the Bureau. The same program is applicable to the conch or borer which takes the place of the drill in the southern waters.

The proposed work comprises three separate projects which geographically overlap each other. The States of Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, and New York are primarily concerned with the starfish and to a lesser degree with the drill. In the States of New Jersey, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, and to a certain extent in North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia, the oyster drill is of paramount importance. The outbreak of the leech in Apalachicola Bay and the possibility of its spread to the

adjacent waters is of great concern in Florida. In Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Texas the oyster bottoms suffer from an attack of conch or borer, the distribution of which is highly localized.

In order to provide for an efficient management of the campaign of eradication, the whole coastal area will be divided in four principal sections with a regional director in charge of each section. The first section comprises Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, and New York, with headquarters at New Haven, Conn. The second section covers New Jersey and Delaware, headquarters at Port Norris, N. J.; the third one includes Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia, headquarters at Beaufort, N. C.; the fourth section comprises Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Texas, headquarters at Apalachicola, Fla. A brief outline of the work to be carried out in each section follows:

FIRST SECTION (FROM MASSACHUSETTS TO NEW YORK)

Control of starfish by means of dredging and mopping. Investigation regarding the life history, spawning habits, and migrations of starfish. Field experiments with traps. Study of the chemical-control methods—laboratory and field experiments with copper sulphate, alum salts, and other substances. Eradication of oyster drills by means of traps. Amount allotted, $73,000.

SECOND SECTION (NEW JERSEY AND DELAWARE)

Control and eradication of the drill. Field experiments with improved types of traps. Observations on migrations and spawning habits of the drill. Control of starfish (mopping and use of chemicals). Amounted allotted, $19,000.

THIRD SECTION (FROM MARYLAND TO GEORGIA)

Control and eradication of the drill in lower Chesapeake Bay, Tangier Sound, and eastern shore of Maryland and Virginia. Field experiments with improved types of traps. Survey of oyster bottoms in North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia, with the view of determining the places of infestation by drills and conchs; eradication of these pests by dredging and trapping. Amount allotted, $55,000.

FOURTH SECTION (FROM FLORIDA TO TEXAS)

Investigation of the life history of the leech. Experiments on methods of its eradication. Dredging and cleaning the destroyed reefs in Apalachicola Bay. Survey of oyster bottoms in Alabama, Mississippi, and Texas, with the view of determining the localities infested with conchs and boring clams. Eradication of these pests by dredging and trapping. Control and eradication of conch in Louisiana. Amount allotted, $103,000.

Estimated expenditures, oyster-pest project, by States

		Labor	Other	Total
Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York	Starfish	$45,000	$28,000	$73,000
New Jersey, Delaware	Drill	15,000	4,000	19,000
Maryland, Virginia	do	25,000	5,000	30,000
North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia	do	20,000	5,000	25,000
	Boring sponge		25,000	65,000
Florida	Leech	40,000		
Alabama, Mississippi	Conch	15,000	4,000	19,000
	Leech			
Louisiana, Texas	Conch	15,000	4,000	19,000
	Boring clam			
Total		175,000	75,000	250,000

Estimated expenditures, oyster-pest project

Personnel:	
Investigative, administrative, supervisory, and clerical positions, including travel and subsistence, 20 percent	$50,000
Labor for trapping drills, mopping starfish, and tonging and dredging leech-infested waters, 50 percent	125,000
Other expenses:	
Materials and supplies, 10 percent	24,000
Equipment, 4 percent	10,000
Purchase, hire, and maintenance of vessels, vehicles, and laboratories, 14 percent	36,000
Miscellaneous, 2 percent	5,000
Total	250,000

REDUCED PROJECT FOR OYSTER-PEST CONTROL

Should the appropriation for the pest-control project be limited to $100,000, the work in general will follow the outline given above, with the difference that the greatest part of the money will be spent for investigation and field experiments in those sections where the pests are already known to be very abundant and destructive. The two projects differ in the amount of actual eradication work.

Under $250,000 appropriation an additional $125,000 will be spent for manual labor engaged in eradication work and $25,000 for hire of boats and purchase of material and supplies. Consequently under the smaller appropriation there will be a higher overhead, for the same amount of research work carried out.

The difference in actual operations in various sections can be summarized as follows: In the northern section no dredging and mopping of starfish will be carried out, and the work will consist of field and laboratory experiments on extermination of starfish, studies of its migration, use of chemicals in protecting oyster beds, and destroying young starfish.

In New Jersey, Delaware, Maryland, and Virginia the number of drill traps used in eradicaion will be materially reduced. In Florida the work will be limited to the study of the life history of the leech, methods of eradication, and their application in the field. No dredgings or tonging will be carried out on the destroyed reefs, the centers of infestation from which the leech spreads to adjacent territories.

In the Gulf States a distribution of the pests will be studied and field experiments on their eradication will be carried on on a small scale.

Estimated expenditures, oyster-pest project, by States

State	Labor	Other	Total
Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York	$16,500	$8,950	$25,450
New Jersey, Delaware	10,000	2,000	12,000
Maryland, Virginia	10,400	5,000	15,400
North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia	6,700	3,250	9,950
Florida	11,600	11,250	22,850
Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas	5,400	2,000	7,400
	4,700	2,250	6,950
Total			100,000

Estimated expenditures, oyster pest project, total, $100,000.

Personnel:	
Investigative, administrative, supervisory, and clerical positions, including travel and subsistence	$36,000
Labor, for field tests, trapping drills, tonging oysters, and boat crews	23,000
	59,000
Other expenses:	
Materials and supplies	10,500
Equipment	7,500
Purchase, hire, and maintenance of vessels, vehicles, and laboratories	20,500
Miscellaneous	2,500
	41,000

Mr. COCHRAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. COCHRAN. I notice in the report that there has been placed in the bill the amount necessary for the enforcement of the Black Bass Act.

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. COCHRAN. I was very much amused, being a member of the Committee on Accounts, to see on the bill of fare in the House Restaurant time and time again fresh-water bass. I know that our distinguished colleague in charge of the restaurant would not tolerate the purchase and sale of any bass contrary to law. Fresh water is probably a misnomer, and by calling attention to it I know the matter will be corrected.

Mr. OLIVER. I will state that our committee has felt this appropriation item should either be discontinued or preferably the item transferred to the Department of Agriculture, where in our judgment it appropriately belongs, and can with the aid of the Department of Justice be effectively enforced. The Senate, however, holds a different view and we have yielded to their insistence.

Mr. COCHRAN. I do not object to the appropriation, but I do not think the law should be violated in the Capitol.

Mr. MEAD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER. I yield.

Mr. MEAD. With regard to the eradication of pests in the oyster industry, there was a measure introduced in the House by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND]. The House took a definite attitude in connection with that item. There was a committee appointed by the Speaker of the House, of which the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] is chairman. I really believe that the appropriation

with regard to matters of this particular kind ought to be considered and acted upon by that committee that has been created to consider subjects of that kind. I would like to ask the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] if he has had an opportunity to go into this matter of the eradication of pests in the oyster industry.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The investigation is very necessary.

Mr. MEAD. But the gentleman's committee has not had an opportunity to go into it as yet?

Mr. ROBERTSON. No.

Mr. OLIVER. The President vetoed the bill reported out by the committee to which the gentleman referred, and in the veto message stated there was existing authority, in his opinion, to make the appropriation. This appropriation is more than the Bureau of the Budget estimated was necessary, and since the gentleman from New York [Mr. BACON] has inserted in the RECORD the break-down of how the Bureau of Fisheries has indicated the money might be spent, I simply want to say that the expenditure will be carefully reviewed by the Secretary of Commerce and the Director of the Bureau of Fisheries, and perhaps by the President, with a view of seeing that no money is imprudently spent. Neither the gentleman from New York [Mr. BACON] nor I wish any of the money uselessly spent. We are hopeful that there will first be a scientific study, with a view of determining whether some way can be found for eradicating the pests, because it is a matter of great importance to the oyster industry. Simply because we give them $100,000 is no invitation to wastefully spend the money. I have communicated with the Bureau of Fisheries, who have very distinguished scientists, and we think they will be cautious in the expenditure of this money. They will make preliminary studies with a view of determining whether there is reasonable promise of practical remedies being found whereby these pests can be eradicated before spending large sums on untried methods.

Mr. MEAD. But in view of the fact we have this separate committee, I just thought I would bring it to the attention of the House that the Members might know what was being done in the matter.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I had intended to make a statement this morning in reference to some items carried in the four department bills, and especially in connection with the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce of the Commerce Department. I find, however, that there is an important bill which the House is anxious to dispose of today, which will be taken up after this conference report, and for that reason I will omit any extended statement as to the matters I had intended discussing.

I will ask your unanimous consent to insert, as a part of my remarks, selected excerpts from four statements made by representatives of leading business organizations before our committee when hearings were being had on the appropriations for the Department of Commerce. Since these statements are from distinguished representatives of large business organizations, I invite the careful reading of the same by Members of the House. The appropriations for the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce were drastically cut as a result of our drive for economy in Government expenditures from more than five millions to approximately $2,000,000, and the useful service it had been rendering was seriously interfered with. The Budget submitted an increase for this Bureau for 1936, and our committee increased the Budget recommendation, but still the amount carried for this important service is, in my judgment, probably inadequate. The statements made by business organizations as to the helpful service which this Bureau is rendering at this time suggests that when this matter is later brought to the attention of the President and the Bureau of the Budget the appropriation for this Bureau will be further increased, and I wish now to say that our committee, in view of the representations which business men generally have submitted to our committee, will give sympathetic consideration to any reasonable increase in appropriations for this Bureau. Dr. Murchison, the Director, is able and enjoys the full confidence of the American business men, and deserves credit for the efficient service which the Bureau has rendered with its limited appropriation. Dr. Dickenson, Assistant Secretary of Commerce, under whom this Bureau falls, is likewise very much interested in its work, and at the suggestion of our committee, extended to certain representative business men an invitation to appear before our committee when the hearings were being had. From the statements made by these business men, I now ask unanimous consent to insert excerpts.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. OLIVER. The gentlemen who appeared before the committee and made statements were as follows:

Mr. Harry Tipper, executive vice president American Manufacturers' Export Association; Mr. Phanor J. Eder, director of international and comparative law section of the American Bar Association, Pan American Society, and Colombian American Chamber of Commerce; Mr. Wallace Thompson, representing National Federation of Foreign Trade Associations; Mr. Eugene Thomas, president National Foreign Trade Council, New York City.

I first submit the following excerpts from the statement of Mr. Harry Tipper. The full statement of Mr. Tipper will appear on pages 283 and 284 of the hearings—

Mr. TIPPER. Mr. Chairman, the association that I represent has 450 members who are scattered generally over the United States, and the industrial divisions include practically every form of exporting, from locomotives to chewing gum, so that the association deals widely with the subject of export trade.

The board of directors of the association has been gravely concerned over the curtailment of the services of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, because of the numerous reactions from the members of the association in that they have not been able to secure the customary services from the Bureau to the extent and with the facility that they were able to secure them in the past. At a time when the conditions of doing export business are more severe and involve more problems than heretofore, and when the information has become increasingly important and valuable and more imperative, it has been rather tragic that the services should be so seriously cut. The most important questions and those which are asked most frequently by our members relate to economic conditions abroad, in various countries—the financial conditions of the country, the general trade conditions, the balance of trade, the specific character of trade, the principal products of the country; the tariff and regulation conditions, which are subject to a vast amount of change and involve a vast amount of difficulty; customs procedure, and information on the general consumption and the general competitive situation nationally; that is, what other countries are supplying to that region and what competition there is from other nations in the market.

Those are the questions that our members indicated they asked most frequently, and it is for that reason that they so regularly apply to the Bureau for information, in addition, of course, to using the statistics which the Bureau supplies regularly, and upon which all exporters depend for their basic information.

Mr. OLIVER. The members of the committee are quite familiar with the history of this Bureau. Of course, at one time it was very rapidly expanded in its personnel, both at home and abroad, and I assume that special attention was given them, and has been given since, to the selection of business men well qualified to understand business problems and to interpret the information which you sought in the language of the business man here at home. If this service has been helpful to you, as you indicate, it is probably primarily due to the fact that such statistics as may have been gathered abroad or at home have been interpreted in the light of your present business problems, and by persons who were familiar with business conditions at home.

I now wish to quote the following parts of the statement made by Mr. Phanor J. Eder. His full statement will be found on pages 284, 285, and 286:

Mr. EDER. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I have been in business contact with the export and import trade for about 30 years, sometimes almost personally engaged in it, but chiefly as a lawyer for export houses and some import houses.

There is very little that I can add to what Mr. Tipper has said, except that he has emphasized only the export end. The importation of products which we do not produce in this country is also necessarily an important factor to which the commercial attachés abroad lend their help.

I have come in personal contact abroad—I have done a lot of traveling, especially in the Latin American countries—with the commercial attachés and can testify to the very sincere and very helpful work that they do. They occupy a position in countries abroad which cannot be filled by any other agency of the Government. It cannot be filled, for instance, by the consuls because, although as a matter of law and theory a consul is not a diplomatic officer but a commercial representative of his country, nevertheless, as far as the general public atmosphere in those countries is concerned he is, in fact, looked upon as a representative of the foreign

office and not in any way as a commercial representative. The consul is handicappel by that fact in obtaining the information and giving the help that the commercial attachés can furnish; and it seems to me that it would be eminently desirable to extend the work and the status of the commercial attachéship offices abroad and increase the number of commercial attachés.

Mr. OLIVER. May I ask whether in your travels abroad, since you have indicated you have frequently had occasion to travel, you have found that foreign governments maintain abroad, and in the countries in which you have traveled, officials similar to trade commissioners?

Mr. EDER. Oh, yes, sir.

Mr. BACON. As a matter of fact, there has been a very great expansion of that activity on the part of the Government of Great Britain, has there not?

Mr. EDER. Yes, sir; I understand so; and France also, and Germany at one time engaged very extensively in that work, and even some of the smaller countries. I have been surprised by the work that a country like Mexico is doing in other parts of Latin America.

I now wish to submit the following excerpts from Mr. Wallace Thompson's statement. His full statement may be found on pages 286, 287, 288, 289, and 290 of the hearings:

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Chairman, there are 18 associations that are members of the National Federation of Foreign Trade Associations. They are as follows:

Baltimore Export Managers Club, Export Managers Club of Chicago, Export Managers Club of St. Louis, the Foreign Trade Association of San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, Foreign Trade Club of Cincinnati, Foreign Trade Club of Newark, Foreign Traders Association of Philadelphia, Houston Foreign Trade Club, Manufacturers Association of Connecticut, Inc., Overseas Automotive Club (National), Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce, Pittsburgh Foreign Trade Council, Akron Chamber of Commerce, Northwest Foreign Trade Club (Minneapolis-St. Paul), Los Angeles Foreign Trade Association, Buffalo Export Club, Cleveland Export Club, Export Club of Detroit.

These clubs and associations represent, in a way, the "little fellows", the export managers of the whole country, as well as of those cities. These men are now trying to do a very large proportion of their work by mail and advertising and through contacts other than their own personal representatives or the representatives of great export companies. They make journeys through the foreign field from time to time, but they depend basically for the material with which they plan their campaigns upon the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce. They have built the outside contacts of their companies through the Bureau; and the history of the Bureau, from Mr. Redfield down, is written in the books of these young and old—and all of them experienced—export managers in all parts of the country.

We have had contacts with these men ourselves, from New York, and always in the most delightful way; but in every case they have been coming to Washington rather than to New York for their introductions to foreign business men. They go abroad and come back enthusiastic over the service that has been given them. They are introduced to business men; they are given statistics; they get by word of mouth, in the field, from the commercial attachés and the trade commissioners, the names of possible representatives—things that cannot be put on paper—things that the State Department could not possibly touch.

They go to the field and they can get a service which gives them the opportunity to play the game on an equal footing with, first, Great Britain, and after that the lesser nations, and today, above all others, Japan. They have come to look upon the representatives of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce as their spearhead. They know them as the persons who will come back to them with the information that they must have for planning their campaigns for going out and building this strong backbone, as it is, of our world commerce.

In other words, we are asking for the continuing help without which we cannot carry this banner of trade over the world. Trade has decreased all over the world in the last few years, of course, but today it is reviving. There are many indications of this revival.

We feel that the Bureau's service as it is progressing now has proven to be the right service, and is proof in very concrete form of the growing confidence that is going to make it possible for us to go forward in pushing foreign trade.

Mr. OLIVER. It occurs to me that the strength of this service has been, we must assume, that there has been care shown in the selection of men who were business men to perform this duty and who viewed it from a business standpoint. The Department is clothed with full authority at any time, when they have made a mistake in their selection of a man to carry on this work, to make a change at once.

I have felt that in matters where business problems are constantly changing, as we know they are and will continue, it is of the utmost importance that the business man be consulted as to whether those who are representing his interest in the collection of information, such as has been referred to, are really performing efficiently, and, if not, there should be absolutely no restraining influence of any kind, legal or otherwise, from making a change immediately and putting a man in who can do the work.

Mr. BACON. As a matter of fact, at this moment we are more in need of help from commercial attachés due to the increasing competition from Japan; is not that true?

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes, sir; that is very true.

I now quote from the statement of Mr. Eugene Thomas, who is probably one of the most widely known business men in the foreign field. Mr. Thomas' complete statement may be found on pages 290–295:

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I had the pleasure of appearing before this committee on December 20, 1932, before the plans of the present administration were inaugurated, looking to the drastic curtailment of the services abroad of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce. Immediately those plans were announced as being in process of formulation, the various foreign-trade associations and organizations throughout the country began to make their wishes known in Washington and as a result of a questionnaire sent out by Secretary Roper, May 8, 1933, the organizations throughout the country unanimously signed a memorial in which they set forth their views as to the future organization and conduct of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, particularly with respect to its agencies abroad.

Since that time—and I may say parenthetically that a number of the recommendations made by these organizations jointly were followed, but the process of drastic curtailment went entirely too far, as a consequence of which the services have been seriously impaired and in the opinion of the foreign traders of the United States represented by these organizations are hopelessly inadequate on the present basis.

This continuing interest on the part of the foreign traders culminated again in March 1933 in a great convention in Pittsburgh, at which resolutions were adopted and forwarded to the various departments and administrations along the same lines.

These activities also continued to a point where memorials were addressed to the President of the United States in June of this year, signed by many foreign-trade organizations.

This particular subject, therefore, has been a continuing one, of intense interest to all of these organizations, to the extent that it has formed at monthly meetings the chief topic of conversation or discussion in New York.

I should like to have for the record the names of these organizations, including those represented here by Mr. Tipper and Mr. Thompson. Mr. Tipper represents the American Manufacturers Export Association; Mr. Thompson, the National Federation of Foreign Trade Associations, among the leading organizations throughout the country. In addition to these, this joint committee for foreign-trade action, which I have referred to, represents the National Foreign Trade Council; the American Japanese Trade Council; the American Chinese Trade Council; the Council on Inter-American Relations; the Export Managers Club of New York, an organization of over 400 exporting firms; the National Association of Credit Men; the National Council of American Importers and Traders; the World Trade League of the United States; and the Textile Export Association of the United States.

Representatives of these various organizations gathered on last Friday in New York and this subject was considered of so much importance that we immediately telephoned to Washington in an effort to obtain from you, Mr. Chairman, if practicable, an extension of time so that representatives from all over the country could appear before this committee to submit the necessary detailed memorials. We found the time not sufficient and therefore we three have been delegated to come down to represent this joint foreign-trade community.

The exporters of this country believe that they, as taxpayers, are entitled to the same sort of representation that they had in previous years; and, moreover, there is a wide-spread belief that this would not cost the Government anything additional, because it has been proved, or is capable of proof, that the actual assistance rendered by the representatives of the Bureau abroad has been reflected in such increased volume of business that the profits on that volume of business, reflected in the taxes collected by the Government, are many, many times greater than necessary to compensate for the outlay of the Government in providing these facilities abroad. It is simply a question of dollars and cents. If we can restore, in any part, the $3,000,000,000 of export trade alone that we have lost, and which is capable of restoration with proper representation abroad, both by governmental agents and by the firms themselves, the profits on that business will be reflected to a degree which will make any large increase in the present appropriation more than justified in returns into the coffers of the Government.

Mr. BACON. An increase in our foreign trade to the point where it was in 1929 or 1930 would restore a great many thousand people back to work in this country, would it not?

Mr. THOMAS. It would restore many. Mr. Tipper had an estimate of the number of people who are affected by our volume of foreign trade, which I should be glad if he would present to you.

Mr. TIPPER. We prepared for the National Industrial Conference Board meeting the other day the results of an examination of the dependency of employment on foreign trade. We have had various calculations on employment, some of which have dealt specifically with those who are actually in export organizations or on docks that were actually moving export goods, but nothing has been done to indicate the real dependency on foreign trade.

For instance, we called attention to the fact that the State of Texas, which exports 90 percent of its cotton crop, normally has over 3,000,000 people dependent upon foreign trade for their livelihood; 1,700,000 people in the rural sections and approximately 1,500,000 in the urban sections whose livelihood would be lost if that trade were eliminated.

Mr. McMILLAN. Let me interrupt to ask, is that not true to greater or lesser extent throughout the Cotton Belt?

Mr. TIPPER. It is true throughout the country. We exhibited a map before the Senate Finance Committee last year which showed that every State in the Union has an interest in foreign trade. We showed the extent of that interest in dollars. The conclusion is that there is not a single State in this country that is not dependent to some extent upon foreign trade for its employment.

Mr. THOMAS. What is the total of the figures that you show as to the dependency on foreign trade for employment?

Mr. TIPPER. The dependency on export, the total figures are 3,000,000 on the farms, 1,300,000 in industry, and 7,000,000 in trade, transportation, and supplementary services—over 7,000,000 people, workers, not families.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I should like to go on from that point and say that that represents merely exports. But the interest of this administration has been clearly expressed frequently in the necessity of increasing imports, to carry out its policies and to compensate not only for our existing volume of exports but for the increased volume which is expected to result from the operation of the reciprocal trade agreements and from the export-import banks and other agencies which are being set up by the Government.

Adequate attention has not been given to the information which is properly necessary to be supplied in foreign countries to enable that expansion of imports into this country which is absolutely necessary if the policies of this administration are to be carried out and we are to have that degree of balancing of trade which will not necessitate the continued extension of very large foreign loans abroad, to compensate for the excess balance of exports over imports.

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

Mr. OLIVER. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, with respect to the comment of my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] about the sale of black bass in the Capitol restaurant, I am pleased to assure him that I have made an investigation and have found that the black bass served in the House restaurant are not the large-mouthed black bass of fresh waters in which the disciple of Izaak Walton is so much interested, but are black sea bass, a salt-water fish, which, under the law, can be sold legally.

Mr. COCHRAN. Then they should take off the menu in the restaurant the description "Potomac bass", because there is no salt water where those bass are found in the Potomac River. Bass of that kind do not come out of salt water; I have caught too many of them for the gentleman to tell me that.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I was told that by the manager of the House restaurant; that the sale of Potomac black bass was illegal. He assured me these came from Chesapeake Bay; that these were black sea bass.

Mr. COCHRAN. If the gentleman will read the menu he will see that it reads "Potomac black bass"; and if he will look at them he will find they are fresh-water bass.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a brief question?

Mr. OLIVER. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Did the conference committee increase the amount for the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes; the President submitted a Budget estimate for $143,000 plus, and that has been approved.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. That is for the Foreign Service, and I am delighted; but was the amount increased for the Department of Commerce, the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce?

Mr. OLIVER. Only the Bureau of Standards, which is under Mr. Dickinson. The appropriation for the Bureau of Standards was increased by $30,000, and the House conferees concurred in that. That, however, is within the estimate originally submitted by the Budget. Our committee increased the appropriation for the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce $30,000, which the House approved. The Senate approved the House increase.

The bill for the four departments as now reported is $1,376,757 under the original Budget estimates.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the conference report was agreed to was laid on the table.

MINORITY VIEWS

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the filing and printing of the views of the minority members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs on Senate bill 267, for the relief of certain officers and employees of the Foreign Service of the United States who, while in the course of their respective duties, suffered losses of personal property by reason of catastrophes of nature.

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

There was no objection.

OLD-AGE PENSIONS

Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include therein a radio address delivered by me on the subject of old-age pensions.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address which I delivered March 17, 1935, on the subject of the Old-Age Pensions:

Good evening, my fellow Americans, the Roosevelt administration and the Seventy-fourth Congress are definitely committed to a sane and reasonable system of old-age pensions. It has been said that President Roosevelt was running on every ballot in the Nation last November. You will remember that candidates everywhere during the last election, seeking offices from the United States Senate down to constable, exploited a platform which favored a system of old-age pensions. There have been many social-security bills introduced in the present session of Congress. Most of these proposals have been either so fantastic in their generosity to the aged or so ultraconservative and pinchpenny that the noble purpose would be defeated by their enactment. But now the first blush of excitement for something too opulent and far too radical has subsided into a saner demand for a reasonable, just, and equitable method of providing a program, not spectacular but a program that will redound good of a lasting and permanent nature for the aged people of this Nation.

I have the honor of having introduced in the present Congress the first measure dealing with old-age pensions. You may be sure that I am not an egotist who thinks that mine is the only plan. But because of the universal acclaim that my proposal has received I beg leave to discuss with you briefly the outstanding tenets of my measure. First, however, let me explain that my bill, H. R. 2856, has the endorsement of the National Old-Age Pension Association. Dr. J. E. Pope is president of this organization. He has done a wonderful work in creating favorable sentiment for security legislation. He has been tireless in his efforts and deserves universal acclaim for his work. My bill provides that all citizens of the United States over the age of 55 years shall receive $30 per month, provided they are not engaged in the field of competitive earning.

If a citizen of the United States who has been a resident of this country for 20 years is unemployed or does not have sufficient income to maintain himself, he would be entitled to receive $30 per month from the Federal Government. This plan does not require the cooperation of the various States. Most of them are unable to assume any additional burdens, so this proposal is confined to the Federal Government. My bill also provides that any citizen of the United States above the age of 21 years, who is physically or mentally unable to earn his living, would receive $30 per month. Necessary funds would be provided by a levy of 1½ percent on all earnings of persons between the ages of 21 and 45 years. The plan calls for an appropriation of $250,000,000 to initiate the program. I have drafted amendments, to be submitted when the bill is considered on the floor of the House, which propose to pension persons between the ages of 60 and 65 in the amount of $40 per month, and persons over the age of 65, $50 per month.

President Roosevelt has submitted an old-age-pension plan to Congress that calls for a maximum of $15 per month to citizens over 65 years of age, with a method of State participation. Numerous States have indicated that their financial condition will not permit this cooperation. I am not opposed to President Roosevelt's old-age-pension plan. It is a great step forward, but it does not go far enough. It represents the most conservative plan of social security. It is good and desirable as far as it goes, but the fact remains that it is inadequate. It does not make ample provisions for social security. It would be discriminatory in its effects with the aged of the various States. It does not provide for our elderly people until the beginning of the fiscal

year 1936. The State legislatures would have to meet and make appropriations to match all or any part of the $15 Federal fund. At best, it would be late 1936 or 1937 before our needy aged could realize the benefits of the administration's program. What we need is an equitable, reasonable Federal system of old-age pension now.

Since I introduced H. R. 2856 last January 3, I have received millions of signatures to petitions from people in every State in the Union urging immediate congressional action on my bill. You can look in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any day and find listed, under the heading of "Petitions", page after page where people by the thousands and millions are sending me petitions favoring this bill. The mere listing of these by town and county requires from 3 to 9 pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD every day. The number of petitions favoring this plan of old-age pensions exceeds by far those received on all other legislation combined. It is phenomenal that this proposal has such wide-spread acclaim. It is looked upon as a plan that is conservative enough to satisfy those who would protect the Federal Treasury and progressive enough to meet the demands of social security. It takes a middle course.

Old-age pensions was once considered a wild, radical scheme. Those who were bold enough to advocate pensions for our aged were met with distrust and suspicion of their fellow men. No longer does this hold true. No longer do we undertake to condone the philosophy of these lines:

In savage tribes where skulls are thick
And primal passions rage,
They have a system sure and quick
To cure the blight of age.
For when a native's youth has fled
And years have snapped his vim,
They simply knocked him on the head
And put an end to him.
But we of this enlightened age
Are built of sterner stuff,
And so we look with righteous rage
On deed so harsh and rough.
For when a man grows old and gray
And weak and short of breath,
We simply take his job away
And let him starve to death.

Ludicrous as these lines may seem, we are faced with the fact that they contain what has been our principle of social economy in the past. Today we all recognize the need for an adequate system of old-age pensions. Embodied in H. R. 2856 a far-reaching humane plan of national old-age pensions is a schedule that will provide security for the aged, and at the same time will add no hardship to the tax-paying public. It is another way to spread the wealth of this Nation. It is an open road to happiness and contentment in old age. Since Congress is pledged to enact some system of old-age security, and since the President is committed on this problem, I feel that the adoption of my proposal will aid in breaking the depression, will help us to be our brother's keeper, will make us remember the forgotten man, and will serve as an effective supplement to the program already initiated by the Roosevelt administration.

COTTON CONTROL

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6424), to continue the Cotton Control Act, to exempt a limited quantity of cotton from the tax thereunder, to provide for the better administration of such act, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6424) to continue the Cotton Control Act, to exempt a limited quantity of cotton from the tax thereunder, to provide for the better administration of such act, and for other purposes, with Mr. LANHAM in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, this bill is composed of amendments to the so-called "Bankhead bill." It does three things: First, it exempts the producer, whether owner, share cropper, or tenant, who has been producing cotton and who has a base production of less than 2 bales, the amount of his production this year to be not to exceed 2 bales; second, it provides an appeal board consisting of a representative of the Secretary of Agriculture, the Attorney General, and the secretary of agriculture of each cotton State, to which board appeals may be made of disputes relative to decisions of county committees; third, it provides a compensation for the ginners of 25 cents per bale.

We have endeavored to get figures as to the amount of increase that would be allowed by virtue of the 2-bale exemption. It has been impossible to get accurate figures. The Department has taken the base production in five States of those who made 2 bales or less and assumed that the same ratio applied in other States, and on this basis have estimated that there are 518,000 farmers who have allotted or who have a base production of 2 bales or less.

It is probably fair to assume, according to the figures which they have, that the average production which they have in those 518,000 will be about 1⅓ bales; so the only possible increase would be the other two-thirds of a bale for those who produce this year an amount in addition to the average production which they had heretofore. Those figures assume that every one of them would produce the full 2 bales. There would be a possible additional allotment for those who had a little above 2 bales who by virtue of the reduction program would be reduced below 2 bales. There are 418,000, I think it is estimated, who produce between 2 and 3 bales. Some of those in their actual allotment this year would be reduced below 2 bales. They would get an additional possible production in order to bring them up to the 2 bales. That has been estimated by various individuals at about 117,000 bales. I take it the only possible addition, the way this is worked out, would be probably between 400,000 and 500,000 bales. This is assuming that our estimates as to the number of farmers is correct.

The Department estimates that the increase would be greater than I have estimated. I include at the end of my speech the estimates of the Department.

The Department is authorized under the bill to fix the allotment for this year. That can be absorbed in the regular allotment, or added to it, depending on the attitude of the Department. Mr. Chairman, there are a number of Members interested in this measure, so I will reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. SNELL. If these small producers produce say 400,000 bales more than they would under the allotment, will that be taken away from the large producers, or will it be just so much more cotton produced?

Mr. JONES. That will depend on the total baleage fixed by the Department.

Mr. SNELL. I thought we had fixed that at 10,000,000 bales?

Mr. JONES. That was the first year. The second year it was to be fixed by the Department, based on existing conditions.

Mr. SNELL. They may do anything they like?

Mr. JONES. Yes; of course, those figures are not accurate. The Department estimates it would be a little more than that, but I am giving the best I can under the circumstances.

Mr. MOTT. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. MOTT. Can the gentleman tell us the total number of cotton growers?

Mr. JONES. Yes; approximately—about 2,400,000.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman tell us about how many bales of cotton are now being produced?

Mr. JONES. I can give the gentleman the figures for last year and for a series of years, if he wishes that information. I can also give him the carry-over. The production for the season 1933–34 was 13,047,000. For the season just passed, 1934–35, the production was 9,731,000 bales.

Mr. TABER. How much of each year's production was exported?

Mr. JONES. I have not the figures accurately. The exports from the United States for the season 1933–34 were 7,534,000 bales. We do not have those figures complete for the 1934–35 season. I have that somewhere in my papers however. I may say it is much less this year than last year.

Mr. TABER. Does the gentleman estimate about 4,000,000 bales?

Mr. JONES. No; I do not think there was that much. You understand that there was a drought in a great stretch of the cotton country, and the exportations for this past season were comparatively small. I do not know exactly what it was. I have it somewhere in my papers. However, it was comparatively small this last year.

Mr. TABER. Were the 1934–35 figures above or below the allotment?

Mr. JONES. Does the gentleman mean the export figure or the production figure?

Mr. TABER. No; I refer to the allotment figure.

Mr. JONES. The total carry-over of American cotton was reduced last year.

Mr. TABER. And the production was below the allotment or above?

Mr. JONES. Yes. The production was a few hundred thousand below.

Mr. TABER. What is expected this year in the way of allotments?

Mr. JONES. I believe the Department has set a tentative figure that the allotment will be 10,500,000 running bales plus the outstanding certificates, which, as I recall, are around 400,000. Those figures are all approximate.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Has the gentleman the figure for the present carry-over?

Mr. JONES. Yes. For 1934–35 the carry-over of American cotton in America on August 1, which was the beginning of the season, was 7,647,000 bales, and the American cotton in world trade was 10,634,000.

Mr. TARVER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. TARVER. I understood the chairman of the committee to say that it is the purpose of the committee by this bill to allow the exemption to every producer of cotton whether he be the owner of land, a tenant, or share-cropper, and to give him the privilege of marketing two bales of cotton exempt from the tax.

Mr. JONES. True, if he has been and is a producer of cotton. It would not give the privilege to new men unless they came under the terms of the original act.

Mr. TARVER. It seems to me the language of section 2 is difficult of construction, and I doubt if the Department of Agriculture would definitely and clearly construe this language as effectuating the gentleman's purpose and the committee's purpose. If that is true, would the gentleman or the committee have any objection to clarifying that section in order to make clear the purpose?

Mr. JONES. If the object is to clarify and not complicate some of the other language, there would be no objection. I may say that we had the best cotton men in the country go over this bill, and they think there is no doubt about the language.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Number of cotton growers producing on the average of 2 bales and less, and between 2 and 3 bales during 1928 to 1933, in 1934 for selected States with an estimate for the entire Cotton Belt

(From 1934 Bankhead applications, on basis of 478-pound bales)

State (1)	2 bales or less (2)	Between 2 and 3 bales (3)	3 bales or less (col. 2+col. 3) (4)
Alabama	61,895	49,515	111,410
Arkansas	33,833	32,897	66,730
New Mexico	260	314	594
North Carolina	56,624	30,779	87,403
Oklahoma	30,907	32,940	63,847
Tennessee	22,936	19,733	42,669
Total	206,475	166,178	372,653
Estimate for entire Cotton Belt [1]	518,781	417,532	936,314
Estimated average production [2]	518,781	1,043,830	1,922,611
1935 allotment, assuming 35 percent reduction	337,208	678,460	1,015,668
Plus 103,000 bales allowed for making allotments as regulations now read in determining the national allotment of 10.5 million			1,118,668
Estimated requirements for making allotments by proposed plan [3]	1,037,562	835,064	1,872,626
Necessary increase in allotment			753,958

[1] Assuming that the same relationship for small producers as compared to the number of applications exists in the remainder of the Cotton Belt.
[2] Assuming one bale as average for the group included in two bales or less.
[3] Granting two bales to each producer unit falling in the two groups.

The two groups above do not include the 1934 Bankhead applications covering farms on which cotton was grown in 1934 for the first time since 1927, a large percentage of which fall in the two groups. There were approximately 75,000 such applications on which it is estimated there were about 60,000 producer units growing less than 3 bales and would increase the 753,958 bales to 850,000 bales.

It is estimated that the producer units omitted from applications in 1934 and the increase in 1935 of the number of producer units would easily increase the draw upon the national allotment to from 1,500,000 to 2,500,000 bales.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, under the unanimous-consent agreement through which the pending legislation became privileged, it was agreed the first section of the bill concerning the extension of the processing taxes for an additional year will be eliminated. I believe this is good judgment, as it will not complicate the situation. The poor tenant farmer of the South, who has suffered untold hardships and misery through the curtailment program will not be forced to carry on his back the extension of the law. That can be considered later and on its own merits.

With the section eliminated, I recognize the urgency and the need for the prompt passage of the legislation. Hundreds of thousands of cotton farmers, that class for which the American people have the most sympathy, have been pushed into dire distress through the operations of the curtailment program. These small farmers, whose total income from cotton production would be only $120 a year, have been obliged to bear additional burdens. Think of it: Placing increased burdens on a people who find it almost impossible to obtain the bare necessities of life, and whose greatest worry last fall was to obtain the needed cotton cloth, that their children might be enabled to go to school. I am reliably informed six or seven thousand families in Alabama alone were in that situation last September. Only an appeal to the relief officials solved their problem. J. S. Wannamaker, of South Carolina, president of the Cotton Growers' Association, has stated the curtailment program forced 40 percent of the cotton growers onto the relief rolls. Certainly it must be evident to anyone there can be no recovery in this country through a law which operates in this manner.

I am for the amendments which would eliminate the two-bale tenant farmer from the tax, even if the Department is reported to look with disfavor on the proposal. It is absurd to think of taxing a cotton grower whose income is $120 a year, or $180 a year. It is like going to the poorhouse and taking up a collection for charity. What if the large grower does find he is hit a little through the relief given to the small growers? He must expect to make some contribution to the task of rescuing the submerged millions in his own neighborhood.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Does not the gentleman believe that Congress might well go further and exempt four bales rather than only two bales?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Personally, I would think that four bales of cotton is a small enough amount, because, after all, what is $240 a year to the small cotton growers.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I may say to the gentleman that I have an amendment prepared which will do that very thing.

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

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. DIES. I want to state to the gentleman that in my district farmers who produce a bale of cotton were cut down by the Department of Agriculture to as low as 250 pounds of cotton, and this was not just one instance, but occurred in numerous instances.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I do not subscribe to regulation of that character. I know how it has already affected the South. I know the misery it has brought to many people.

Mr. NICHOLS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. NICHOLS. Does the gentleman understand that this bill provides for the exemption of two bales of cotton to every cotton farmer who came within the purview of the act of last year?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I would not want to answer that question because I do not know just who did come under the act of last year.

Mr. NICHOLS. If he did come under the act of last year his two bales of cotton will be exempt under this bill, will it not?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I would prefer that the gentleman address his question to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. JONES. That is correct; it affects his production this year up to that amount.

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

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. DIES. Does not the gentleman believe that it would be far wiser for Congress to provide a domestic allotment plan giving to the farmers direct out of the Treasury a subsidy and enable us to hold and maintain the markets of the world for our cotton producers.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I think the gentleman is absolutely correct, and a little later I hope to approach that subject more in detail.

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

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Yes.

Mr. EAGLE. I am very pleased to have the assistance of my colleague from Texas, and I may refer to the fact that 2 months ago I introduced a domestic-cotton allotment bill and shortly we will have open hearings and I want everybody to help us perfect that measure.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I am not concerned about any opposition that the large cotton grower may have to the legislation that is pending here today. I think the large cotton growers should be willing to make some contribution to the welfare of these submerged millions, particularly when they live in their own part of the country.

We have a great problem to solve as to cotton. All of us are interested in a proper solution, whether we represent cotton growers, cotton spinners, or the consumers. We must not act too hastily. The ablest business men of this country are trying to reach a just solution. That is why it would have been ridiculous to try to give the verdict in a 2-hour Saturday afternoon discussion, with the main proposal tied up as a rider on a relief bill for the poor tenant farmer.

I am neither sectional nor partisan in my consideration of this problem. The cotton grower and the cotton spinner, whether they be in the North or the South, have a common bond of interest. It is decidedly to the benefit of each that the other shall be prosperous. If the cotton grower obtains a fair price for his cotton, he will be prosperous and he will have the purchasing power that will materially contribute to the activity of the cotton spinner. If the price is too high, beyond the figure which the consumer will pay, there will be a lessened demand and the grower and spinner alike will suffer.

If the cotton spinner is unduly penalized, if he is forced out of business, the grower loses a home customer which he will never replace. If the price is forced beyond a figure which will permit the export trade, there is sure to be an economic crisis in the South because more than half of the cotton grown has in the past found its way to foreign countries.

The foreign trade is seriously threatened. This notwithstanding the fact that it is generally recognized the best cotton in the world is grown in the South. It has more character than the cotton of India or Brazil; it permits greater efficiency in operation. All this may well be true, and yet it will be found price will be a determining factor in export trade.

Japan, Greece, and Yugoslavia are trying to produce cotton in a small way. Great Britain, Belgium, and Italy are giving their encouragement to the production of cotton in their colonial empires in Asia and Africa. Japan is stimulating cotton growing in Manchukuo and Korea. Brazil dreams of a cotton empire which will be larger than that now in the South. With these movements throughout the world, the United States must move cautiously if cotton is to maintain its traditional place in American life.

We cannot play too lightly with the economic future of millions of our countrymen. It is all right to try experiments, it is all right to give subsidies, but no experiment should be attempted unless it is thought clear through. And if it be demonstrated the experiment helps only a few and places an impossible burden on many millions of our people, we should be frank enough to admit failure and try some other method of giving relief.

I am for relief for the cotton farmer. I believe he is entitled to aid, but I want that relief given in such a way it will not bring disaster to millions of other people and in the end bring destruction to the cotton grower himself.

I am not for letting a few theorists in the Department of Agriculture make this decision. I believe this great problem could be solved in a more equitable way if we invite leading cotton growers, cotton spinners, representatives of the consumers, outstanding business men of the country, to come here and discuss this problem in a judicial way, with the one thought in mind of what is best for the country.

If we did this, we would get legislation which would give some promise of solution and would make a real contribution to recovery. This method of just getting the testimony of a representative of the Department of Agriculture, who is probably most concerned in building up the numerical strength of his division, and then reporting out what he wants after a perfunctory discussion, is not going to solve a problem of this magnitude. It is not going to rescue the American people from poverty and distress.

During the last 2 days representatives of the cotton-spinning industry from all sections of the country have been gathered here in Washington. They have come to see if plans could be devised which would save their industry from the threatened destruction.

Mr. DIES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. DIES. Do not the figures show that our exports of cotton are rapidly declining every month in comparison with the consumption of foreign cotton?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The facts show the gentleman is correct. The distress in the cotton-spinning industry is most acute.

One large mill in North Carolina has recently closed its doors. A large mill in Georgia is facing a similar fate within a few weeks. Another large mill in Georgia, for the first time in its history, saw red figures appear last July. Since that day, every month has seen similar red figures. It is one of the best-managed mills in the South, and is known to pay wages 15 percent higher than most southern mills, yet it cannot live under present conditions. Mills in Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, Pennsylvania, Alabama, and South Carolina are similarly threatened. It is not a local menace, but one Nation-wide in its scope, embracing every part of the country.

It is a real peril, and the President of the United States is the one man who can help the most. I hope he will not permit an industry to perish, an industry which directly employs 500,000 persons and which indirectly provides a livelihood for several million additional families.

The cotton grower of the South is vitally concerned with the peril of his best customer. It is no profit to him to see this home market steadily slipping. If foreign competition becomes acute, he will need more than ever the home market, and it is to his interest that it be maintained.

The processing tax has been a burden which the textile industry has not been able to pass along to the consumer except in few instances. In theory the consumer was expected to pay the entire bill, but with the purchasing power of the masses actually less this year than last year, it has not been possible to pass the tax along.

There was reached in many instances a price which could not be exceeded without stifling demand or else losing the

market to substitutes. Consequently an industry which has been stripped of its reserve surpluses through years of adversity has found itself fettered with unbearable taxes to pay for the relief of cotton growers.

The cotton grower should be given his relief. I am for this, but I say it is manifestly unfair to drain the lifeblood of one industry to pay the bill of what is distinctly a national problem. Not only is it unfair but unwise as well. If you rescue one group at the cost of the destruction of a larger group, you have not made any progress toward recovery.

Much more sensible would it be to give the cotton grower his relief directly from the Treasury or, at least, widen the base of the assessments to the end that no one would be ruined.

If this processing tax was shifted from the cotton industry, jobs would be available for thousands of more people. No greater relief contribution could be made than to put more people back to work in private employment at real wages.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. McCORMACK. Are not our textile industries being placed in jeopardy by imports from Japan?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The gentleman is correct. It is a serious threat, and if the deluge continues there will be very little of the textile industry left in this country.

I believe the one man who can help us is the President of the United States, and I hope he will do so. He can arrest these tremendous importations from Japan coming into this country every day and depriving the American people of the opportunity to work that belongs to them.

Last year there was imported from that country 7,000,000 square yards of cotton goods. In the month of January 5,000,000 square yards were imported and as much more on the 1st day of February alone. All that has caused loss of employment to American workers.

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

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. The figures show that in 1933, 1,700,000 square yards of cotton cloth were imported from Japan. In 1934, 7,700,000 square yards, and in January 1935, 7,000,000 square yards; in February 1935, 12,000,000 square yards; and on March 1, that day alone, 5,000,000; making a total of 24,000,000 square yards to date in this year, over three times the total in 1934, and many times more than the total of 1933.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman for his valuable contribution. The full extent of the peril is obvious to anyone who investigates the subject. It is obvious to the workers who daily see their opportunity to earn a living by honest toil being taken from them.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Yes.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I interrupt to state that the gentleman in his broad approach to this subject affords a good example to the Members of the House in dealing with a great economic problem at this time.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. No one is more interested than I am in solving this problem. That is why I am glad it is going to be delayed so we can approach the subject in an intelligent and honest way. It is too great a national problem to try to solve in 2 hours of general debate.

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

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Yes.

Mr. CITRON. Our textile exports have decreased in the last 5 years from almost a billion dollars to about $400,000,000. This whole textile situation is a matter not only for the manufacturers, but for the cotton growers, and is a complicated matter. Many of our factories are leaving this country because of various reasons. I have introduced a bill which provides for a study of the whole situation, and I hope the gentleman will come to the support of my bill so that we can get all of the facts.

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

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Yes.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman from Connecticut is mistaken. Our exports are six times as much as the gentleman gives them. Has the gentleman any information as to where the cotton that Japanese cloth is made of comes from? I understand that it comes from India.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. A great deal of it.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Oh, no.

Mr. KNUTSON. Those are the facts. And the records will show that Japan is putting in a big acreage in Manchukuo and will be independent of American cotton in 3 years.

Mr. DIES. And is not the cause of the increase in the importation of cotton from Japan due to the depreciation in the yen?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Also, labor gets only 20 to 22 cents a day in Japan.

Mr. DIES. But the yen has been steadily falling.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. And the labor lives on rice, and it does not cost much money to buy rice in Japan.

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

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Yes.

Mr. McMILLAN. May I state for the information of the gentleman from Massachusetts that in addition to the great amount of finished cotton goods now being annually imported into our country, to which reference has just been made by our friend and colleague [Mr. McCORMACK], that many thousands of bales are also annually imported for manufacturing purposes directly in competition with our own cotton. The Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce has just recently supplied me with some statistics in this connection which are most impressive. For instance, in 1932 there were 104,000 bales imported; 1933, 146,000 bales; 1934, 144,000 bales. It seems to me that some policy should be immediately adopted to prevent, if possible, the importation of cotton grown in foreign countries, if our farmers and the cotton industry are to be protected.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The gentleman is entirely correct.

Our task today is a simple one. Let us give relief to the tenant farmers. God knows no one will deny him his humble place in life or want to make it worse. Let us delay action on the extension of the life of this experiment. Then let us all get together and forget about the department brain trusters and see if we cannot work out relief for the cotton grower which will give him a chance to save both his home and foreign markets, and at the same time not bring about the destruction of his best customers, the cotton spinners, both North and South.

It is one of the gravest problems before the American Government today and worthy of the most serious consideration. Certainly, as the law now stands, it gives a very minimum of relief and is slowly but steadily strangling the cotton spinner and the small cotton grower, and eventually will ruin the South. The problem should be approached in a genuine patriotic way, with a realization all have a right to live and the country advances though all being prosperous. [Applause.]

Mr. DONDERO. How many bales of cotton are we importing from abroad now?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The gentleman from South Carolina stated 144,000 bales.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. DOXEY].

Mr. DOXEY. Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, knowing full well the interest of those who have the welfare of the cotton South at heart, and especially the Members of this body who by their words and acts have expressed themselves in favor of a better and more equitable administration of the present Cotton Control Act, better known as the Bankhead Law, I desire to express my sincere appreciation to each and every one who has made it possible, over much opposition, for us to be able to consider my bill (H. R. 6424) at this time.

Realizing that quite a number of you have already requested time to discuss this bill together with the fact that our time is limited, it will not be my purpose to dwell upon conditions of the cotton producer, the nature of complaints in regard to the administration of the act last year, or the reasons that prompted me to introduce this bill and do all that I could thus far to have it enacted into a law. The hearings before our full committee for several days, then the time and study given it by our subcommittee, and the general developments, are partially reflected in the printed hearings on this bill to which I invite your careful consideration.

Some rather unusual things have transpired since February 12, 1935, the day I introduced the original bill (H. R. 5578), which has been the basis of our consideration and is amended by this bill (H. R. 6424). The Secretary of Agriculture since then has issued quite a number of regulations and proposed rules looking forward this year to a better and more equitable administration of the present Cotton Control Act. In my humble judgment, however, he has not yet gone far enough and has not yet set up the right administrative machinery to do the job properly or to give the relief that I feel the cotton producer, who should be classed as owner, tenant, and share-cropper, is entitled to. I am afraid that unless we enact definite and specific legislation, clearly expressing that it is the intent of Congress that the small farmer, including the tenant and share-cropper, is to be given some of the "breaks", so to speak, he—the small producer, owner, tenant, and share-cropper—will find that in the administration of the act this year he will fare about as he did last year.

We want to better his condition and give him at least a 2-bale exemption tax free this year, providing he raises that much.

We also want an appeal board to whom any producer of cotton, feeling that his county committee has not given him his full share of cotton allotment tax free, can appeal his case, present his claim, and procure relief if he is entitled to it. We want and expect each allotment to each individual farmer to be made public.

We also want the ginners paid out of the funds set aside to administer this act, a reasonable fee for the extra trouble and expense they are put to in ginning the cotton and making their report in regard thereto.

We further feel that some of the regulations of the Secretary of Agriculture last year should be changed, and that the cotton farmer should be permitted to express himself this fall, as he did last year, as to whether he desires a continuation of some form of cotton-production control next year.

Permit me here to remind you and to earnestly warn you that there are some powerful influences against this bill, as well as against any legislation, whatsoever, dealing with our cotton situation. They do not want us to legislate at all in our efforts to benefit the cotton farmer. They would like to see this bill amended so as to wreck it, and in fact to destroy the entire cotton program that has been of such great benefit thus far to the cotton farmer. Do not be deceived and vote for amendments that will kill the bill. To load it down with amendments or to materially change it, means no legislation at all in this regard at this session of Congress, and will make matters more and more complicated when we try to legislate on the subject next session.

Some of us know of the efforts of the opposition. We all have within the last few days seen unmistakable evidences of the plan to demoralize the efforts of this administration, and to bring about a radical change of policy by propaganda and by otherwise arousing and poisoning the minds of the people. Everything is being done to counteract the great relief thus far given agriculture by this administration. There is a well-organized and powerful influence doing effective work in breaking the cotton market. The recent downward trend and violent break in the price of cotton, whereby cotton declined in a single day nearly 2 cents per pound, is positive proof of what the manipulators, speculators, and cotton-market gamblers are trying to do and what they can do.

Recently I introduced a bill (H. R. 5367) for the prevention and removal of obstructions and burdens upon interstate commerce in cotton by regulating transactions on cotton-futures exchanges, and for other purposes, which, in my judgment, will go a long way toward remedying such a disastrous situation.

Our Committee on Agriculture has given much time and thought to this proposition, and on March 14 voted to report out of the committee favorably H. R. 6772, "To amend the Grain Futures Act to prevent and remove obstructions and burdens upon interstate commerce in grains and other commodities by regulating transactions therein on commodity-futures exchanges, and for other purposes", which includes the principles set forth in my bill H. R. 5367 with reference to regulating cotton transactions on the cotton-futures exchanges. In other words, H. R. 6772 amends the Grain Futures Act by including cotton as a commodity, which has never heretofore been in any wise regulated as to transactions on futures exchanges, which bill we hope will soon be enacted into a law.

In the well-organized scheme to pound down the price of cotton and in other ways to discredit and thwart the efforts of the Roosevelt administration, all kinds of false rumors are being published and disseminated throughout the land, not only in this country but also in foreign countries, in an effort to bring about a lower price at the expense of the Government, which is now holding several million bales of farmer cotton, and at a great loss to the cotton farmers of this country.

Our enemies have said and published that this administration was going to change and even abandon its loan and crop-restriction policies with reference to cotton. Special mention was made of the Doxey bill (H. R. 6424) that we are now considering.

It was charged that as the Rules Committee of the House had given a rule on the Doxey bill and that bill would have the right-of-way, there would certainly be an increase in cotton production this year if the bill should be enacted into law. Nothing is further from the truth. The Doxey bill in no wise changes or increases the total present allotment to the entire country or to any cotton-producing State or county. It simply changes the method of distributing the same total allotment of cotton. It permits the little cotton producer to grow and sell more cotton tax free and requires the big grower to produce and sell less tax-exempt cotton.

I do not believe the Members of this House or the country at large will be deceived by any such false and extensive propaganda that is now flooding the country.

The situation is serious, our responsibilities are grave. Are we going forward or backward? The fate of this particular bill, so far as this House is concerned, is in your hands. The friends of this measure have brought it to you, wide open, so to speak. Any amendment that is germane is in order. If we can strengthen and better the bill by amending it, I am for amendments. If not, I am against them. Let us make the best bill possible and pass it today.

Would that I had the time to give you certain facts and figures in regard to this cotton situation as it exists today and to take this bill up section by section and analyze it and give you the reasons therefor. Time will not permit a detailed explanation. My printed report (No. 335) on this bill is an effort to give a comprehensive and concise explanation of the bill as amended by the committee.

The original bill, H. R. 5578, that I introduced is as follows:

A bill to continue the Cotton Control Act, to exempt a limited quantity of cotton from the tax thereunder, to provide for the better administration of such act, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That the second and third sentences of section 2 and the first sentence of section 3 (a) of the act entitled "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", approved April 21, 1934, as amended, are amended by inserting after the phrase "the crop year 1935–

36", wherever such phrase appears, the phrase "or the crop year 1936–37."

SEC. 2. (a) Section 4 of such act, as amended, is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(h) If the allotment of tax-exempt cotton to land of any producer of cotton (on his behalf as share-cropper or tenant) is less than two bales for the crop year 1935–36, there shall be exempt from the tax imposed under this act so much of the cotton harvested on such land during such crop year as is in excess of the allotment but not in excess of two bales. No producer shall be entitled to exemption certificates on the amount of cotton exempt from tax under this subsection, but, upon proof of the right to exemption under this subsection in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Treasury, bale tags shall be issued for such cotton. For the crop year 1935–36, the quantity of cotton allotted under section 3 (a) shall include the amount which the Secretary of Agriculture estimates will be tax-exempt under this subsection and the amount of cotton apportioned under section 3 (b) shall be the amount so allotted minus the amount of tax-exempt cotton so estimated."

(b) Section 23 of such act, as amended (relating to the definition of "bale"), is amended by inserting after "3", in the last sentence thereof "4 (h)."

SEC. 3. Section 6 of such act, as amended (relating to allotments to producers) is amended by inserting "(a)" before the first sentence thereof, and by inserting at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(b) (1) The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to establish, as soon as practicable, in each State a board to be known as the 'Allotment Appeals Board', which shall consist of a representative of the Department of Agriculture designated by the Secretary, and, with the consent of the State, the attorney general of the State or a person designated by him, and the secretary of agriculture of the State of a person designated by him.

"(2) Subject to such rules and regulations as the Allotment Appeals Board may prescribe relating to the time, place, and manner of hearing and disposing of appeals, any producer of cotton or any share-cropper or tenant who has been granted an allotment by, or whose application for an allotment has been denied by, the county committee, may appeal to such Appeals Board from the action of the county committee. The Appeals Board shall consider such appeal and, on the basis of the law and facts, shall affirm, modify, or set aside the action of the county committee. The decision of the Appeals Board shall be final and the Secretary of Agriculture shall make provision for carrying out such final decisions.

"(3) The members of the Appeals Board shall be allowed compensation at the rate of $5 per day while actually engaged in the work of the Board, except that the representative of the United States Department of Agriculture shall be paid such compensation as the Secretary may fix. Subject to the approval of the Secretary of Agriculture, the Appeals Board may appoint such clerical and stenographic assistants as may be necessary and may incur such expenses as may be necessary. An itemized statement of salaries and other expenses so incurred shall be submitted to the Secretary of Agriculture at such time as he may require and shall, when allowed by him, be paid out of moneys available for administrative expenses under this act.

"(c) The allotment to each producer in each county for the crop year 1935–36 shall be made public either by posting on the bulletin board of the courthouse in that county, or by publication once in a newspaper of general circulation within the county, the name, address, and amount of allotment to each producer."

SEC. 4. Section 9 (d) of such act, as amended (relating to transfer of exemption certificates), is amended by inserting after the first sentence thereof the following new sentence: "No rule or regulation of the Secretary of Agriculture shall prohibit the transfer or assignment by a cotton producer of certificates issued or reissued by him to another cotton producer who is a resident of the same State."

SEC. 5. Section 17 of such act, as amended, is amended by inserting "(a)" before the first sentence thereof and by inserting at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) Appropriations for administrative expenses under this act are authorized to be made available to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to pay any person, who, in connection with the operation of any cotton gin, was obliged to collect tax imposed under this act on any cotton harvested during the crop year 1934–35 or during the crop year 1935–36, and who applies to the Secretary therefor, compensation for the collection of such tax at the rate of 25 cents per bale of 478 pounds (and fractional parts of a bale in proportion) for collecting the tax on each such bale."

Mr. Chairman, time will not permit me to discuss the merits or the demerits of the Bankhead bill. The amendments proposed in my bill are what I shall endeavor to explain to you, and how they will work if we adopt them. My good friend from Massachusetts, Mr. MARTIN, has just made a most interesting and illuminating speech with reference to conditions in New England regarding the processing tax. It does not bear on this bill at all. Out of deference for these people here and in view of the fact that we wanted to expedite the passage of this important measure, as time is the essence, we agreed to eliminate, for the present at least, section 1 of the bill H. R. 6424, which I introduced, and therefore we will not discuss whether or not the Bankhead Act shall be continued or whether the people at this time shall have the opportunity to vote. With section 1 of the bill for the present eliminated by agreement for the purposes I have outlined, what does section 2 do? Section 2, in as clear language as we were able to express, provides that the two-bale farmer—and the farmer is to be classed as owner, sharecropper, and tenant—is to be given an exemption of two bales of cotton, provided he raises that much, if he has any allotment at all coming to him. That is section 2 of my bill, and that is all it is. I am for anything that will better the bill, and I hope that we will do what we can to try to better it; but I ask you gentlemen to remember and to beware and realize we could kill this whole proposition by loading it down with amendments, whether they sound good or not. We can do too much in trying to have our cake and eat it too. We can easily talk this bill here to death as well as try to get something we know will not be passed by the Senate or approved by the President. We know the opposition to this bill is powerful and far-reaching. We know people say it cannot be administered because of the two-bale exemption to the little farmer. They estimate it will take too much cotton away from the sum total allotted to the country at large.

Mr. TARVER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOXEY. I am always glad to yield to the gentleman from Georgia or anybody else if I can answer their questions in the limited time I have.

Mr. TARVER. I know the gentleman's purposes are sincere, but I call his attention to the language of section 2, the first portion of which reads as follows:

If the allotment of tax-exempt cotton to land of any producer of cotton is less than two bales—

And so forth. It seems to me there is a very good chance for the Department of Agriculture to construe this to tie the allocation to the land, and not to provide for a minimum allocation to the producer who has no land, who is a tenant or share-cropper of as much as two bales. I know that is not the purpose of the Doxey bill, but the language could very easily be clarified by providing for the allocation to each producer unit of not less than two bales.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOXEY. I yield.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Let me call attention to lines 24 and 25 in the Doxey bill which provide distinctly that it shall be a tenant or a share-cropper cultivating the land.

Mr. TARVER. Oh, no; it does not say that. It says where the land is cultivated by a tenant or a share cropper the certificate shall be issued to him. How many certificates? Does it mean two bales' worth of certificates to 5 or 6 tenants or share-croppers on the land? The bill is indefinite in that particular and it ought to be clarified if the gentleman from Mississippi intends to provide for a two-bale allocation to each producer.

Mr. DOXEY. I am sure both gentlemen know that was and is the intention of the author of the bill, who is myself. Under the 5-minute rule this bill will come before you open, and it can be clarified and amended, but let us not make any amendments except those that may clarify or clear up our intentions specifically.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DOXEY. I yield, gladly.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Before the gentleman gets away from section 2 let me give the gentleman this information: In the State of Georgia last year there were 28,029 producer units, that is, individual farmers, receiving less than a two-bale allotment; 1,228 receiving only 240 pounds, 6,203 receiving from 240 to 478 pounds, 9,016 receiving from 479 to 717 pounds, and 11,541 receiving between 718 and 959 pounds of cotton.

Mr. DOXEY. I appreciate the contribution from the gentleman from Georgia. We are all familiar with the figures and conditions of our respective States, yet we know the figures which the Department now has are not complete, and they will admit it, and this is an estimate only.

I want to tell you how this bill will work and what will happen with reference to this allotment if we pass this bill, which I hope we will.

I believe the figure which the gentleman gave for Georgia shows more than 20,000 cotton farmers in his State who will be in the two-bale class, but I am confident we can take 20,000 as an average for the 13 cotton-producing States and we will have somewhere in the neighborhood of a correct estimate of how many farmers will be affected by the bill we are considering today. Thirteen considered as the cotton States times 20,000—the average for each State, just for the purpose of illustration—is about 260,000. That is the number of two-bale farmers that will be affected throughout the cotton-producing States of this country. If each farmer produces two bales—two times 260,000 is 520,000 bales That is less than a million bales; approximately a half million bales that go for the purpose of continuing the thing we are trying to do—that is to help the small farmer—and if it is taken from the allotment of the big farmers or the great cotton producer, I say to you it is nothing but right. But under the facts and the plan I propose, the Secretary of Agriculture can so allot it that nobody will be hurt, and all this bugaboo about the impossibility of administration and the telegrams that you are receiving and I am receiving in opposition to it, inspired from Washington and other sources and places throughout the country, appear to me to be rather far-fetched and based on a false premise, and I do not believe they are based on the facts and figures if it is worked out in a practical way.

Now, I want you to know that the general pool will be about 10,500,000 bales; unaccounted for, nearly 700,000 bales last year. I make the prophecy—and my guess is no better than anybody else's guess—that no farmer this next year will get a smaller allotment than he got last year if you pass my bill, and those farmers who did not get what they were entitled to will get the benefit of it, especially the 2-bale farmers. You know it cannot likely be extended beyond the 2 bales, because that was the pronouncement of the President and that is what they voted on. If the program would stand more, all well and good.

Mr. COOPER of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOXEY. I yield.

Mr. COOPER of Tennessee. I am hoping the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi, author of the bill, will not consume all of his time without at least discussing the other two phases of the matter covered by this bill.

Mr. DOXEY. The gentleman appreciates that we are pushed for time. Now, I will discuss the next section.

Mr. NICHOLS. Will the gentleman yield on section 2?

Mr. DOXEY. I will yield, but we can take that up and work it out under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. NICHOLS. It seems to me it is timely that the gentleman from Mississippi further explain section 2.

Mr. DOXEY. I ask the gentleman not to take up all my time please. I would not make that request, except that we can take care of all these things under the 5-minute rule.

Section 3 of this bill provides for an appeal board. We had no appeal board last year. Does not everyone agree that we want better administration of the Bankhead bill than we had last year? [Applause.]

Your applause and your other expressions of approval show you agree with me. You will not get it, in my judgment, if you do not pass some legislation. When you analyze the rules and regulations that have been issued by the Department of Agriculture, you will see that we have given to the farmer various things but the share-cropper and the tenant are not classed as farmers by the Department of Agriculture as Congress intended. That appears in the hearings and I invite your attention to the hearings.

Section 3 of my bill sets up an appeal board. Any farmer who is aggrieved, whether his allotment is 2 bales or 1,500 bales, can appeal to this board. I am not so much interested in the personnel of the appeal board as I am that there shall be an appeal board to whom the farmers can go with their allotment grievances.

I know that making the allotments public will tend toward a better administration of the act and will give more general satisfaction among the farmers.

Section 4 of my bill speaks for itself, and I feel that there is no opposition to it here on the floor.

Section 5 of my bill provides a fee of 25 cents per bale to the ginners for the cotton they gin this year. They are entitled to at least this amount. There is much that could be said in regard to this section. I know there is strong opposition to paying the ginners anything and opposition to it will no doubt develop here on the floor during the consideration of this bill. Strong opposition to it developed in the committee. However, I hope and trust that we will keep this provision in my bill and be able to pay the ginners at least the amount provided for in section 5 of this bill.

I must conclude, as my time has nearly expired, but I want to say that no administration in the history of this Nation has done more for distressed agriculture than has the Roosevelt administration. We all know, speaking in terms of the cotton producer, that if it had not been for the heroic efforts of this administration and the aid given the cotton producer, he would have been forced to sell his cotton anywhere from 5 to 7 cents per pound. The Government pegging the price of cotton at 10 cents and 12 cents each year for the last 2 years, together with the cash benefits paid directly to the producer by the Government, has been the salvation of the cotton farmer and should we have raised a crop of 15 or 16 million bales of cotton, it is likely that we would not have been able to sell our cotton at all with the great carry-over that we have had and the attitude of foreign countries in not buying our cotton for reasons evident to all of us.

The agricultural program of the present administration is broad and far-reaching. The emergency with which we were faced and which still exists, demanded action. The Bankhead bill was an emergency measure and these amendments that I have proposed are designed to provide for a better and more equitable administration of the original act during this emergency at this time.

The House Committee on Agriculture, of which I am privileged and have the honor to be a Member, has worked long and hard, night and day, on this program. As individuals and as members of the committee, we have been in contact with the authorities who are to administer this act. We have tried to reach an agreement as to just how the law is to be administered this year. As Members of Congress we have nothing to do with the administration of the act. That is the responsibility of the executive branch of the Government. Our part of the Government is the legislative branch, but as Members of Congress we have a right to express our interest, views, and intentions. It is our privilege to suggest and advise and if necessary pass additional legislation if it takes that to have a better and more satisfactory administration of any law. From what I know of the cotton situation from practical experience and from what I have learned of the Department's attitude in this matter, and considering some of the rules and regulations that have been recently issued by the Secretary of Agriculture, I am convinced that satisfactory results will not be obtained in the administration of the Bankhead Act this year, unless we do pass this additional legislation in this form and definitely and specifically express the intention of Congress on these controversial and, to my mind, highly important questions. It means much to our farmers and the success of this phase of the agricultural program in which we should all be vitally interested. Therefore, I am ready and anxious to pass this legislation. That is my reason and purpose in introducing this bill, pushing this measure, and doing all I can to secure its enactment into a law as speedily as possible.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. DOXEY. Mr. Chairman, I shall not ask for further additional time, because I appreciate how many Members want to speak on this subject. I say simply that in bringing in this bill we have tried to bring in the best possible legis-

lation we could in regard to the subject. I thank you all for your valuable assistance and help in passing this bill today. [Applause.]

Mr. KINZER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CULKIN].

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Chairman, the history of the attempt to regiment the American people in the field of agriculture and in the field of industry has been one of disastrous failure. The other day on the floor of the House the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], one of the ablest Members of the House, stated that the farmers were in worse condition now than they were at the outset of the present administration by reason of the operation of the N. R. A. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. WOOD], a leader in civil life in the labor field, able, and scholarly, stated that the industrial worker was worse off than he had been before by reason of the operation of the A. A. A. General Johnson, the present spokesman of the administration, says that the N. R. A. is as dead as a dodo. The Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Wallace, stated in New York on Saturday last that controlled production was through.

I recall the passage of this bill in the House and the forebodings and fears that were expressed on this side of the aisle as to the effect of its passage. Every one of those fears has been realized, and today controlled production of cotton has resulted in three concrete things: First, it has taxed the American people $235,000,000 to no purpose; second, the cotton farmer of the South has lost the markets of the world; and, third, and most dreadful of all, is the fact that it has put a million people, a million human souls, in the highways and the byways of the Southland.

On February 20 in the present year the New Republic carried an article on the conditions in the South. The New Republic is a factual magazine; it does not carry any advertising, so it always prints the facts. I do not agree with its political philosophy, I do not subscribe to that at all times, but at least it is a factual magazine. This magazine had this to say with reference to the conditions in Arkansas, one of the cotton States:

> The situation in Arkansas has now become an open national scandal. Many thousands of share-croppers and tenant farmers have been dispossessed by landlords seeking to take advantage of the cotton-restriction scheme. Some of these persons are put to work in the fields at long hours for wages of 50 or 75 cents a day. Others, men, women, and children, are simply turned out along the highway—to starve, for all the landlords care. Mary Connor Myers, investigator for the A. A. A., whose report of conditions in that area has thus far been suppressed by Department of Agriculture officials, is known to have compared conditions with those in Belgium during the Great War. It is not surprising that the victims of this treatment should have organized into a Southern Tenant Farmers' Union. The landlords, aided by subservient local officials, have broken up all meetings of this union, have jailed its leaders, and are seeking to terrorize its members into accepting starvation conditions.

This, of course, is a wholesale and a complete indictment of this whole scheme.

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

Mr. CULKIN. I yield.

Mr. AMLIE. Is there any way in which Congress can secure access to reports of the kind made by Miss Myers?

Mr. CULKIN. I will say to the gentleman from Wisconsin that I have requested a copy of this report.

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

Mr. CULKIN. I yield.

Mr. ANDRESEN. The committee tried to get that report. We did have the report up to the committee, but we were not able to have the facts in the report disclosed to the committee, because they said the investigation was not completed.

Mr. CULKIN. It is a matter which was in the public prints on February 20.

I wish to call the attention of the House to the humanitarian phase of the situation. This article goes on to state in the editorial vein, if you please:

> When we reflect that all this is the result of the Roosevelt administration's great humanitarian policy of helping the American farmer, we have something that can be nominated for the grimmest joke of the century.

The State of Alabama contains about 2,000,000 people; it is potential in the oil field, it is potential in agriculture, and is very rich in timber. The Federal Government, I will say, Mr. Chairman, has paid in processing taxes to this State $21,629,000, while these unfortunates, white and colored, are walking the highways and the byways with no place to hide their heads or to shelter their children.

This State paid on relief $16,169,000, 94.8 percent of which was contributed by the Central Government; on non-Federal P. W. A., $9,000,000; on Federal P. W. A., $22,000,000; a total disbursement by the Federal Government in that State of $69,733,000. Yet, by virtue of the operation of this bill, the results of which were prophesied in advance, hundreds of people are suffering and living under a condition comparable to the conditions of the Belgians after the German Army machine had passed. Nor, Mr. Chairman, does the financial drain end there; and, I repeat, I am more concerned about the human equation than I am about the money involved. The gentleman from Alabama, Senator BANKHEAD, has introduced in the other House a corollary to this bill. His bill proposes, if you please, that in the rough the Government shall spend another $1,000,000,000 to house the victims of this policy, which has destroyed industry, which has destroyed labor, and which has brought to the dust the southern cotton farmer. This pending bill seeks to right a wrong that has occurred.

It is belated, but what I wish to call to the attention of the Members of the House is that this whole policy is fatal to the Nation. It is fatal to the farmers of the Nation. It is fatal to the men in industry and is a continuing leak from the Federal Treasury, which will eventually destroy our credit and drive us into inflation.

Let me give you one of the results of this fatal policy. In my own town we had a bag factory erected at a cost of about a million dollars. Under the processing tax this factory was unable to operate and, of course, had to shut down. America took from Japan and Germany dominance in the rayon industry, which in this country employed thousands of people. Today that is lost. Brazil is at the present time putting 3,000,000 acres of land into cotton. The whole policy of regimentation, I repeat, Mr. Chairman, is fatal and is destructive of the best interests of America. It is time that this House call a halt on these theorists and " brain trusters " who have led America astray. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DOXEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER].

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the speech made by the gentleman from Massachusetts a few minutes ago, taking into consideration the broad national scope of this legislation, inasmuch as it is not only of interest to the cotton sections of the United States but would help every section of this country.

If what the gentleman who has just preceded me said is true, certainly he ought to be heartily in favor of the passage of this bill, because we propose to take care of the very type of people about which he has been talking; and certainly, if we can make the cotton South prosperous, it will be reflected in every section of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, much has been said through the mails, by the press, and especially by the enemy of the cotton program, in reference to destroying our foreign markets. I want to say to you that two-thirds of it is nothing more or less than propaganda. When we poured millions into foreign countries during the war our exports were fine. After the war, when our Government came to a halt in making loans, what happened? The great banking interests of the country conceived an idea that they would take up where the Government left off. They proceeded to flood the country with millions of worthless foreign stocks and bonds. During this time our exports were good, regardless of the

price of cotton in the United States. In 1929, when the crash came and innocent banks and the innocent investing public realized what had happened to them in that the value of these stocks and bonds were worthless and the flood of American money to foreign countries came to an end again, our exports began to slow down. I want to state, if we will extend credit to a great many of these foreign countries, they would again take our cotton and other products. There are several things which must be taken into consideration in regard to regaining our foreign markets—the monetary policy, tariff, and the importation of foreign goods.

WHAT ARE THE FACTS?

In August 1934 the exports of cotton were 83 percent of the 10-year average—1923 to 1934—exports for that month. The greatest reduction in exports was in the shipments to the so-called "gold bloc" countries. Consumption of cotton goods, both in foreign countries and in the United States, has fallen off. Why? Because of the lack of purchasing power. Those who are opposing the A. A. A. and the Bankhead bill want normal production, stating in so doing we will regain our foreign markets, which according to their statements will save the cotton South.

During the period 1900–1901 to 1933–34, grouped into years when exports were 6,600,000 bales or less, when exports were between 6,610,000 and 8,600,000, and when exports were 8,610,000 and above, what happened?

Results

Group	Number of years	Average annual exports	Average per pound received by producer	Average annual farm value of quantity exported	Acres required to produce quantity exported annually
1	12	5,738,000	19.8	$559,146,917	17,004,352
2	15	7,582,000	12.6	480,873,267	20,445,066
3	7	9,356,000	10.0	474,576,071	22,668,976

The above table illustrates clearly the effect of price on both exports and farm income from exports. For 12 of the 34 years—1900–1901 to 1933–34—the farm price of cotton averaged 19.8 cents per pound and exports averaged 5,738,000 bales per year and the farm value of the cotton exported averaged $559,146,917. While on the other hand, for 7 of the 34 years the farm price of cotton averaged 10 cents per pound and exports averaged 9,356,000 bales per year, and the farm value of the cotton exported averaged $474,576,071. For each of the 7 years during the period cotton producers planted and cultivated 5,664,624 more acres and harvested, ginned, and marketed 3,618,000 bales more than they did during each of 12 years of the period and received $84,570,846 less for the cotton produced for exports each year. Who profited from these increased exports? Cotton producers did not.

Exporters, cotton merchants, and handlers of cotton secure their profits per bale, the larger the number of bales the larger their profits. What about the farmer? The larger the number of bales, the harder his work, the longer his hours of toil, and the smaller his profit, or no profit at all, and in many cases poverty and bankruptcy. Farmers have played their part. They have never ceased their farming operations to catch up with this surplus; they have not turned off their tenants, but have continued to divide with them, pay their taxes, pay their doctor bills, and bury them when they die. This is not true with the cotton-mill business, banking, or any line of industry. The banking interest, big business, and industry are putting out propaganda at this time that they are hesitating because of what the present administration is doing. They are stating: "If the Government will cut out farm control, stop trying to control or hamper business, business will go forward."

Oh, yes; prior to 1933, during a Republican reign, under farm products to feed and clothe the world but they had that the Government did not attempt any of the present policies. In fact, business, banking, and industry were sitting in the saddle, or, I should say, had complete control, of the administration in power and the Congress. What happened? When Mr. Roosevelt took charge he found that farmers had plenty of cotton, wheat, hogs, and all other farm products to feed and clothe the world but they had no market. Big business, the large banking interests, and industry, had bled the people white; they had no place to go. They "hesitated" while farmers were going into bankruptcy and unemployment and breadlines increased.

We have heard much from these groups that are hesitating about the Government plowing under cotton and killing hogs to get rid of the surplus. Yet, when they hesitate, from time to time, packers refuse to buy hogs, farm prices go down, cotton mills slow down, even close down, and in the meantime they are able to make profits by cutting down and controlling their production. In the meantime, however, by so doing, they are placing farmers and wage earners into bankruptcy, breadlines, and many of them to untimely graves.

Quoting Mr. Anderson some days ago when he appeared before the Agricultural Committee opposing farm legislation, he stated in answer to a question by me that the great flour-milling industry prior to 1933 when these mills were buying farmers' wheat at 30 cents per bushel, they made money. Although he was opposing the wheat program and the processing tax that under Mr. Roosevelt has given wheat farmers 90 cents for wheat, he acknowledged the fact that his industry made more profits in 1933–34 than they did prior to 1933 at which time farmers in the West were burning corn and going on a strike.

Why not investigate the fact that during the time the price of cotton was cheap and when the farmers were starving, certain large cotton merchants in this country exported cotton to the foreign countries and stored it there. During the past year 1934–35 you will find American cotton was consumed by the industries of foreign countries to about the same extent as in previous years. But, we did not export as much cotton for the reason that these large exporters already had the cotton over there and for the further reason they have not the purchasing power.

Now, Mr. Chairman, why the necessity of this bill? It is because under the administration of the Department of Agriculture the purpose and intent of the original bill was not carried out.

If you will refer to sections 7 and 8 of the old bill and the subsections thereunder, it proposed to take into consideration the tillable land on each farm, and whether or not a farmer had voluntarily reduced, or whether or not on account of drought or flood, his production had been cut down.

SECTIONS 7 AND 8

SEC. 7. (a) The amount of cotton allotted to any county pursuant to section 5 (b) shall be apportioned by the Secretary of Agriculture to farms on which cotton has been grown within such county. Such allotments to any farm shall be made upon application therefor and may be made by the Secretary based upon—

(1) A percentage of the average annual cotton production of the farm for a fair representative period; or

(2) By ascertaining the amount of cotton the farm would have produced during a fair representative period if all the cultivated land had been planted to cotton, and then reducing such amount by such percentage (which shall be applied uniformly within the county to all farms to which the allotment is made under this paragraph) as will be sufficient to bring the total of the farm allotments within the county's allotment; or

(3) Upon such basis as the Secretary of Agriculture deems fair and just, and will apply to all farms to which the allotment is made under this paragraph uniformly, within the county, on the basis or classification adopted. The Secretary of Agriculture, in determining the manner of allotment to individual farmers, shall provide that the farmers who have voluntarily reduced their cotton acreage shall not be penalized in favor of those farmers who have not done so.

(b) After the crop year 1934–35 the apportionment shall not be on the basis set out in paragraph (1) of subsection (a) of this section.

(c) The total allotment to farms in each county under this section shall not exceed the approximate number of bales allotted to that county under section 5 (b).

SEC. 8. Whenever an allotment is made pursuant to section 3, not to exceed 10 percent of the number of bales allotted to each State shall be deducted from the number of bales allotted to such State, and allotted in such State—

(a) To producers of cotton on farms where for the preceding 3 years less than one-third of the cultivated land on such farms has been planted to cotton;

(b) To producers of cotton on farms not previously used in cotton production;

(c) To producers of cotton on farms where, for the preceding 5 years, normal cotton production has been reduced by reason of drought, storm, flood, insect pests, or other uncontrollable natural cause; and

(d) To producers of cotton on farms where, for the preceding 3 years, acreage theretofore planted to cotton has been voluntarily reduced so that the amount of reduction in cotton production on such farms is greater than the amount which the Secretary finds would have been an equitable reduction applicable to such farms in carrying out a reasonable reduction program.

The allotments provided for in this section shall be in addition to the amounts apportioned to the counties under section 5 (b).

A lot of these large farmers known as " cotton hogs ", who have been planting practically all of the tillable land on their farms were not cut in line with the provisions of the bill just read to you. The type of farmer we are interested in here is the farmer who was unable to buy but little fertilizer, who was unable to get sufficient supplies and may I say further that when he asked for a seed loan, he had to reduce his acreage 30 percent or he could not even get that small loan with which to carry on.

What position do we find these large farmers and these little farmers in? Let us take 2 farms with 50 acres of tillable land in each. We will assume that both farmers have the same number of acres. One of the farmers continues to make 30 bales of cotton, the thing that has brought about the surplus. The other farmer, because of poverty or voluntarily, reduces to 10 bales, or perhaps, had to cut, as stated, to get a seed loan. Those who framed the bill and worked for its passage intended that the bill would be so administered as to bring the 10-bale farmer up and cut the other farmer down so that they would both be on the same basis. But what happened? They cut both down on the same percentage basis, giving the 10-bale farmer 6 bales and the other farmer with the same size farm, same size family, 18 bales. This is responsible for the poverty in connection with both the Negroes and small white tenants and farmers who own and control the small farms or who farm as tenants.

When we had normal prices and somewhat normal prosperity that same class of farmer, with, usually, a large family, producing three, four, five, or six bales, lived in poverty and could not produce any more. He is still being penalized, and under this bill, while the larger farmers and those who are responsible for the surplus received hundreds and thousands of dollars in rental and parity price checks. These are the farmers who are able to walk around with plenty of money, whooping up the Bankhead bill, while the small farmers and those discriminated against, producing five, six, or seven bales, with large families, are being reduced to poverty and forced to seek relief from the Government.

Mr. Chairman, one of the things that the gentleman [Mr. DOXEY] referred to awhile ago was the Appeals Board. The Department states that they do not want any legislation; that they can handle this; in fact, I have already appointed the Appeals Board. I tried last year, even wired the Department, to appoint an appeals board for each county, but they refused. Farmers, especially those who had not received a square deal, were writing and coming to see me, many of them with tears in their eyes, but I was unable to secure relief for them. We propose under this bill to create an appeals board and not permit the Department of Agriculture to appoint the members of the appeals board, which the Department has already stated would come from the extension service, or recommended by the extension service. The bill under consideration proposes to let the Department name one member, and the other two members will be appointed on the recommendation of the Attorney General and the secretary or commissioner of agriculture in each State. I would like to see a disinterested board in each county. We would then have a board to which farmers can appeal and get justice, wipe out discrimination, and cut down or put up allotments in accordance with what they are entitled to receive under the bill.

I was at the Department recently and find that they have a number of statisticians and economists who will tell you that, to make this little increase up to two bales, it will mean about 2,000,000 bales that will have to be taken from the larger farmers. I want to say to you that, if you will increase it up to three bales, it will not take over 1,000,000 bales. They will also tell you that if you give these little farmers 2 bales, a farmer with 10 tenants will put on his farm 20 tenants. This will not happen and if so that can be taken care of under the rules and regulations under the original Bankhead bill.

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

Mr. FULMER. I yield.

Mr. ANDRESEN. The gentleman has no confidence, then, in the figures of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. FULMER. The gentleman is absolutely correct. I do not deny the facts as presented but I disagree with their conclusions, for the simple reason that their facts are based on the wrong premises. If a farmer does not produce over 2 or 3 bales of cotton, why would he need a tenant? If he produces 10 bales, perhaps, he would not have over 1 tenant. There are not many tenants who would come under the provisions of the 2-bale exemption except in small sections of the various cotton States where, perhaps, the major crop is tobacco or some other basic crop. In this case, certainly, the major crop should be taken into consideration and not the small acreage planted in cotton. In other words, they should take into consideration the planting of these other major crops in allotting cotton to these farmers.

Mr. ANDRESEN. If the gentleman will yield further, the gentleman feels that the operation of the Bankhead Act last year was a failure due to the unfairness of the Department.

Mr. FULMER. As far as being fair to all cotton farmers, and especially the small cotton farmer, yes. As a whole, certainly it has improved the agricultural condition in the South wonderfully. The controlling of production and on account of the benefits received under the A. A. A. many farmers have been able to pay past due taxes, interest, and payments on their mortgage indebtedness, and are in a much better position to buy the things manufacturers have to sell. These improvements in the farming sections have helped business and employment.

The tendency on the part of those who oppose the Bankhead bill and the cotton program, including the large cotton merchants and the cotton mills that talk about the processing tax, is that they want the cotton South to go back to twelve to fifteen million bales. Why? As stated, because their profits are per bale, and therefore they would be able to make more money—purely a selfish interest.

Much has been said about foreign countries shipping in cotton, cotton goods, and other goods that compete with cotton here. Under the Agricultural Adjustment Act, the Secretary of Agriculture can put on a compensatory duty on foreign imports and take care of this situation, and this has nothing whatever to do with the merits of the bill.

The bill provides for the payment to ginners 25 cents per bale for their extra expense, cost of bond, extra bookkeeping, and acting as tax collectors on overproduction by the Treasurer of the United States, provided they do not enter into an agreement or operate under a code which would enable them to take care of the extra expense. If I had my way in writing and passing this bill, I would graduate allotments so as to be fair to small one-, two-, and three-mule farmers and tenants. If this is not eventually done, this class of farmers will have to be taken care of by the Government. The movement has already been started by the Government to rehabilitate these farmers by renting lands and furnishing stock, fertilizer, and supplies. I predict that the next move on the part of the Government will be to buy lands, placing buildings thereon for these unfortunate farmers. What will happen then? Some of these large farmers, some of whom produce one, two, five, and even ten thousand bales of cotton, will be begging for tenants, or will have to sell some of their large holdings.

I was told one farmer in Texas received a rent check for $25,000. Mr. Oscar Johnston, who is holding a very important position with the Agricultural Department here in Washington, produces 20,000 bales of cotton in Mississippi. I would like to hold his rental check in my hands for a while.

Who is responsible for our production? Who are receiving the greater benefits under the Bankhead bill? The answer is simple.

In closing may I state that we can continue to issue bonds, appropriate billions, but until agriculture gets a square deal, farmers get a fair price for their products, cheaper interest rates, and their just portion of the dollars paid by the ultimate consumer, just so long will taxes increase and prosperity remain around the corner.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BOILEAU].

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Chairman, this bill has some very good features, and one feature which, I believe, is very bad.

I believe it is advisable to extend the operations of the Bankhead Act for 1 more year, particularly in view of the fact that its life depends upon the willingness of the farmers to have it extended for an additional year, because under the provisions of this bill we provide a referendum held by the farmers must show that they want the bill to be in effect or to be operative for an additional year.

I am particularly pleased with the provision written into the bill which gives a 2-bale exemption to the small producer, to the share-cropper, to the tenant, and to the other farmers who produce 2 bales or less of cotton annually. In other words, the bill makes the first 2 bales of cotton exempt from tax, and I think this will materially assist the small farmer, the share-cropper, and the tenant farmer.

The provision of the bill that sets up an appeals board is considered of vital importance, and although I have not had sufficient contact with the old appeals system to know how it has been operating, it seems that those who are interested in the operation of this measure feel that an appeals board, set up as proposed in this bill, is very essential.

The one objection I have to the bill is the language contained in section 5, providing for a fee of 25 cents per bale to be paid to the ginners.

I wish to call your attention to the fact that there are about 14,000 cotton gins in the country that have been collecting these taxes during the past year from the producers and turning them over to the Federal Treasury. These ginners estimate that the average cost to them to collect this tax and pay it over to the Federal Treasury averages about 50 cents per bale and they have come before the committee and have asked the committee to put a provision in the bill whereby they shall be compensated for the cost of collecting this ginning tax.

In my opinion it would be absolutely unjust and unfair for the Government to pay this fee to the ginner. The ginners say that they are collecting this money for the Government and that therefore the Government should compensate them for their services in collecting the tax.

It is true that the money goes into the Treasury of the United States, but it is not put into the Treasury of the United States for general fund purposes but for the purpose only of assisting cotton farmers. So in reality the expense incurred in collecting the tax is for the benefit of the farmer, and if there is anyone who should pay that cost, it should be the producer of the cotton for whom the service was rendered.

The General Treasury does not benefit from the tax collected under the Bankhead Act. During last year, only $90,000 was collected under the provisions of the Bankhead Act.

The bill provides that 25 cents a bale shall be paid to the ginner. It is estimated that there will be more than 10,000,000 bales ginned during the next year. That would be two and a half million dollars collected by the 14,000 ginners that perform this service for the farmer. In view of the fact that the Bankhead Act collects $90,000 a year, and I cannot see any hope of collecting any more, I do not see how the country can get two and a half million dollars out of the $90,000 found. It is clear in my mind that part of the money heretofore appropriated for the general purposes of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration will have to be spent to pay this fee to the ginners. I do not believe it is fair; I do not believe it is just and right for them to come here and ask us to pay the cost of collecting the tax.

The cost of collecting that tax should be assumed by the ginner or be passed on to the producers by an increase in the price they charge for ginning cotton. They say that cannot be done. Why, in the name of common sense, can it not be done? It is part of the operating cost of doing business. My opinion is that it can be considered the same as any other item of cost—the cost of machinery, depreciation, labor, and all that goes into the cost of ginning cotton. This service should be performed by the ginner and charged up against the industry rather than coming out of the general fund.

Mr. GREEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOILEAU. I will yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GREEN. I am inclined to think that the gentleman from Wisconsin is correct. Ginners used to charge $2 and $2.50 a bale, and now the price has been pyramided up to $3 and $4 a bale.

Mr. BOILEAU. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. The average charge last year was $4.10 a bale. I am satisfied that they should include in the cost of operation, the cost of collecting the tax. The ginners coming here and asking for this hand-out, is unjustifiable, and when the proper time comes I propose, if no one else does, to offer an amendment to strike out section 5, take that provision out of the bill, and thereby prevent the Government from giving the ginners what I consider an unfair and unjustifiable fee.

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

Mr. BOILEAU. Yes.

Mr. ANDRESEN. Mr. Cobb from the Department, stated when before our committee that if Congress did not take action on compensating the ginners, they could or would, by rule or regulation, pay the ginners for their services.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Oh, I do not think the gentleman will find that statement in the hearings.

Mr. ANDRESEN. He told the committee that.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. In the committee before the hearings he stated they could provide for everything except that.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Cobb did say before the committee that he was sympathetic with the idea of paying something to the ginners for collecting this tax, and he gave the impression, although without using the direct words to the committee, that if we let them go along without in any way amending the act, leaving them to go ahead and do as they saw fit, that they would provide for some kind of compensation to the ginners. If we say definitely, by our action here, that we do not want to pay this fee, I do not think they would have the nerve to go ahead and pay it, even though they thought they could under existing law.

Mr. STUBBS. I would like to point out to the Congress that by adopting this amendment we are going to emasculate the bill and do a real injury to the farmer.

Mr. BOILEAU. I do not think this will emasculate the bill. It is only one phase of the operation of this entire system, and during the last year they have operated without compensating the ginners, and in view of the fact that they are performing no service for the Government I cannot see why the Government should pay them that fee. Of course they are assisting in the collection of a tax that goes into the Federal Treasury, but as the gentleman knows, the United States Treasury does not benefit by the operation of the Bankhead Act, and the act was not intended as a revenue measure.

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

Mr. BOILEAU. Yes.

Mr. DOXEY. Does not the gentleman know that the Bankhead Act or the general cotton program, not only by the exemption certificates and other phases, is paying its way, and its assets exceed its liability?

Mr. BOILEAU. I thank the gentleman for that contribution, and they should continue to pay their way, and the Bankhead Act should be forced to pay its way. We should

not pay this two and a half million dollars in the form of a hand-out to the ginners. [Applause.]

Mr. DOXEY rose.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman from Mississippi permit me to ask him one question?

Mr. DOXEY. I have not any time. I wish I had. The only time I have is at the disposal of gentlemen who have been allotted time. The gentleman from Texas will have time under the 5-minute rule.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. PIERCE].

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Chairman, I am going to vote for this bill, but I am just wondering where we are going. I shall vote to cut out section 5 as I do not believe the ginners are entitled to this extra fee. I am wondering if we are not overloading the whole Triple A Act. Within a few days we are going to be asked to vote on making potatoes a basic commodity. Then if any grower of even an acre of potatoes expects to sell a few pounds, he must have an allotment. Hops must come under the sheltering wing of the Government. It will not be long before we will have the question as to whether or not we are going to impose a processing tax on beef and lamb for the benefit of the corn-hog program. I am wondering if we are not overloading the whole act. Are the consumers going to be able to pay the cost of the commodities after the various middlemen have added all their extra charges? It is beginning to look very serious to me.

Oregon has benefited very much from the Triple A Act, especially in regard to wheat and somewhat in regard to hogs. I have no doubt that the South has been benefited on cotton. Can the cotton and wheat producers meet the competition that must be met in the world's markets? The export market for our wheat is already gone. Only 18,000,000 bushels of wheat were exported last year. You gentlemen from the South are in the same position on cotton. You are fast losing your export market. The Pacific Northwest must find an outside market for thirty or forty million bushels of wheat grown in Oregon, Washington, and Idaho every year. Where is it going? Formerly it went to Europe. Right now some of it is being sold in the Mississippi Valley by reason of a subsidy from the triple A funds. I know full well that this cannot continue indefinitely. Are we approaching this problem from the right direction? I am going along with the cotton Representatives because I am so anxious to see something done. I realize all that you say about the small cotton producers of the South as well as the much harassed farmers of all other regions. Are we moving in the right direction? There are 10,000,000 still unemployed and 20,000,000 on the relief rolls, half fed, not half clothed.

Mr. ANDRESEN. The gentleman has expressed a doubt as to the benefit of the present program. Would it not be better for us to abandon that program and seek an export outlet for our surpluses which we produce in this country rather than continue under the present program of the A. A. A.?

Mr. PIERCE. I am just thinking. I have no decided opinion, but I am beginning to be somewhat worried about the triple A being topheavy, and the whole thing toppling down on our heads. My program would be to reduce interest rates first. Interest on money should never be over 2 percent annually. Interest rates on farm mortgages should never be over 1½ percent annually. Then railroad freight rates should be cut one-half. Every person able to work should have a job even if only that of raising his own food. Tax-exempt bonds should be at once abolished. If all had a chance to consume I do not believe there would be much surplus.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oregon has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. MOTT].

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, I did not know until it was disclosed on the floor a few minutes ago by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] that we were going to defer consideration of section 1 of this bill which provides for extending the Bankhead Cotton Act to 1937. Otherwise I would have had no particular desire to speak on it at all.

I am going to vote for the amendments exempting small farmers from the operation of the act, and, with proper amendments, I shall also vote for the other provisions, since none of them extend the life of the original act. I think there is no opposition to the bill with section 1 eliminated. At least, I am sure there is no opposition on the Republican side, and I have not heard of any even on the Democratic side.

Mr. STUBBS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOTT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. STUBBS. I wish to say there is opposition. I represent a great cotton-producing area, where legitimate farming is carried on.

Mr. MOTT. Very well. I will qualify my statement on that point and will say merely that there is no opposition on the Republican side. We all favor these amendments, just as we all opposed and still oppose the original Bankhead Act. I am going to vote for these amendments because I think they will take at least a little of the injustice and the inequity out of the Bankhead bill.

The Bankhead bill, in my opinion, was one of the very worst pieces of legislation that has ever been passed by the Congress of the United States. Not only has it caused more hardships and suffering to thousands of our people than any other agricultural bill that has ever been passed, but it also went further along the road to complete congressional abdication than almost any other law. And as long as the Congress of the United States continues to abdicate its jurisdiction, and as long as it continues to refuse to legislate on important legislative subjects and turns the jurisdiction of those subjects over to the executive department of the Government, as it did when it passed the Bankhead Act, we will have the same trouble that we are now having under the administration of this act.

You cannot allow the executive department to make the law and expect to get justice for anybody. We had the same experience under the economy act, and we had to repeal it in order to get justice for the veteran. We are having the same experience under the Foreign Trade Agreement Act, and we will have to repeal that before we can get justice. At the present time, under the Bankhead Act, we have learned again that whenever you give the executive department the right to make law the people will suffer.

I opposed the Bankhead Act for several reasons. One was because it provided for compulsory reduction of an agricultural crop, which is wrong in principle, and which, as far as I know, never has worked, either in this or any other nation. I opposed it because I knew if this act were to become even partially successful, probably by this time we would have compulsory crop-reduction laws for every agricultural product in every State in the United States.

As a matter of fact Mr. Tugwell, before the close of the last session, had already introduced in the Senate a bill providing for the same kind of dictatorial, compulsory power over the production of wheat and corn and every other product that the Bankhead bill now provides over cotton; and I say to you now, had it not been for the doubt which existed in the minds of the majority at the last session that the Bankhead bill would work, I believe that broader compulsory crop-reduction laws would have been passed by Congress before the adjournment of the Seventy-third Congress.

Now, although the Bankhead Act has been of very great admitted detriment to a large number of small farmers in the South, and although we are sorry to see the suffering that has been caused by the utter failure of this act to work, yet from another point of view I think the failure of the Bankhead Cotton Act—and the introduction of these amendments is the best proof of its failure—I say that the failure of this bill to work is in some respects very fortunate indeed. It ought to teach us, if it teaches us nothing else, from this time on to take jurisdiction of important legislation in our own hands, to recapture it, if you please, instead of continuously and forever passing the buck on every kind of

legislation to some officer, some theoretical, inexperienced, incompetent person in the executive department, and permitting him by blanket authority to make law for us.

That is what the Bankhead bill did. In that bill you gave the Secretary of Agriculture power to make cotton-production law. That is what the Economy Act did. In that bill you gave the President power to make veteran law. That is what the Foreign Trade Agreement Act, the Tariff Act of 1934, did. In that bill you gave the President power to make tariff law. All those things are wrong. When you surrender legislative jurisdiction to an officer in the executive department you will always find yourselves in trouble, and you will always find that sooner or later you will have to repeal the law by which you surrendered that jurisdiction.

I have already attended two or three hearings on proposed trade agreements with foreign nations, agreements which involve a reduction by Executive order in the protective tariffs which we now have on many of our commodities. Without exception, on every one of those hearings, every delegate in Congress from every State of the Union which grew or manufactured the products involved in the proposed trade agreement, was in attendance before the committee for reciprocity information. They were there, Democrats and Republicans alike, begging that committee not to injure or not to reduce any of those tariffs. They were begging the President, in other words, not to exercise the discretionary authority which they gave him when they voted for that law. That is the situation that we get into whenever we surrender any part of our legislative jurisdiction to anyone in the executive department. I have always voted, and always will vote, against every law of that kind.

I hope, when we consider section 1 of this bill, that we will recapture the jurisdiction surrendered through the enactment of the bill and that we will proceed to repeal the Bankhead Law altogether.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. What does the gentleman say about the success of the wheat program?

Mr. MOTT. The success of the wheat program is doubtful. I get many letters every day from farmers in my district. I should say the great majority of them are utterly dissatisfied with the working of the A. A. A. And I may say also that that has begun to be the case with the N. R. A. We did not go so far in surrendering legislative jurisdiction under these laws as we did under the Economy Act, the tariff act, the Taylor grazing bill, and the Bankhead Act, but to a certain extent we did lay down on the job of evolving and enacting legislation on these subjects, and we turned that responsibility to somebody in the executive department who had never had any experience either in legislation or in the field of business involved in those particular subjects.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MOTT. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Did not the gentleman support the legislation for the wheat grower?

Mr. MOTT. I voted for the A. A. A. as an emergency provision for voluntary crop control and for the reason that most other members of my party voted for it. We needed, in that emergency, some regulation, and the only bill that the Congress was allowed to consider on this subject was the A. A. A. We offered you a better solution, but at the behest of the administration you ignored it, and it was a question of taking that or nothing. It came up in such a way that it could not be amended. You saw to that through your gag rule.

But, understand, I am not putting the A. A. A. in the same class as the Bankhead bill, because the Bankhead bill goes much further. The A. A. A. is voluntary. The Bankhead bill is compulsory. It turns the entire control of cotton in the United States over to the discretion and the whim of one man. It makes the Secretary of Agriculture the absolute dictator over the fortunes and destinies of every cotton farmer in the United States.

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

Mr. MOTT. I yield to my colleague from Oregon.

Mr. PIERCE. Did I understand the gentleman to say that the wheat allotment is not satisfactory to the wheat growers of Oregon? The gentleman does not want to go on record that way, does he?

Mr. MOTT. I said the farmers in my own district. I understand quite well that the farmers in the district my colleague represents are on a little different footing than the ones in western Oregon, because they are wheat growers exclusively and they would benefit to a greater extent than those engaged in the diversified farming of western Oregon.

Mr. PIERCE. Is it not true that the wheat grower who has received an allotment is highly satisfied with it?

Mr. MOTT. No; I would not say so at all. The general sentiment among the farmers of my district seems to be that as long as the Government is handing out this money for destroying crops they might as well take it, but they are not satisfied by any means.

I will state to my colleague what legislation the farmers of my district want. My State is one of 25 States in the Union whose legislatures by formal action have memorialized Congress to pass the Frazier-Lemke farm-mortgage refinancing bill. That is what they want in the way of refinancing aid; and they also want us to pass the Swank-Thomas cost-of-production bill to give them cost of production plus a reasonable profit on that part of their crops which is sold and used in the United States. [Applause.] If the Congress will pass these two bills and in addition will pass legislation to take care of our exportable surplus along the lines proposed in the old debenture bill, our agriculture will proceed immediately along the road to recovery; but if we continue to pass legislation of this kind, the kind exemplified in the Bankhead Act, we shall never get out of the depression and shall never see that long-promised and long-hoped-for brighter day. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DOXEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES].

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, when the Bankhead bill was passed, many of us were led to believe that it would not affect the small farmers. I recall that my friend, the gentleman from Mississippi, Mr. Busby, offered an amendment to exempt the small farmer from the tax, but it was defeated on account of the assurance that in the operation of the law the small one-horse farmer would be taken care of. Much to my surprise, in my district which consists largely of small cotton producers, farmers who in the first instance had raised a bale of cotton, were reduced to 250 pounds. The fact that a man had a wife and four or five children did not make any very deep impression upon those who were enforcing the law from the Washington headquarters. As a consequence, hundreds of small farmers in my congressional district found themselves with an allotment insufficient to pay even the cost of production; and I am very glad indeed that Congress by this act is going to exempt the small producers. We should exempt at least four bales.

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

Mr. DIES. No; I have too short a time. Within the first few days of this session I introduced a domestic-allotment plan. It has been my thought that there are two things the farmer is entitled to. The first is a parity price for his product. As long as we have tariff laws in this country to protect certain industries it is our duty to make these tariff laws function for the agricultural producer of exportable surpluses. The second thing to which the farmer is entitled is the foreign market. The Bankhead bill, and the way it is being administered, in my judgment, will close the foreign markets to the American producer of cotton [applause], because we are storing in Government warehouses thousands of bales of cotton upon which we have loaned 12 cents a pound; and, of course, we cannot sell 12-cent cotton on the markets of the world when the purchasers can buy cotton for much less. So it seems to me we might as well recognize this situation as it is. The farmers of this country will be satisfied if you give them on their domestic consumption, or rather, on the portion of their crop domestically consumed, a tariff benefit that will make the tariff laws func-

tion for them the same as they function for other protected industries. Then let the farmers raise as much cotton as they want to and let the laws of supply and demand control the surplus cotton. [Applause.] It seems to me that by such a measure we would give the farmer an opportunity to earn a profit, an opportunity to hold for us the markets of the world instead of permitting consumption of foreign production to increase. The percentage of cotton consumed on the markets of the world is steadily coming from sources other than our own country.

Mr. Chairman, it stands to reason that if we continue this policy of curtailment, not only will we destroy the small cotton farmer, the farmer who raises from 2 to 10 bales of cotton, but we increase distress. It is not the little farmer who is responsible for the so-called "overproduction"; it is the great plantation owner, the corporate farm. It is the large producer who is responsible for overproduction, yet you are penalizing the little farmer by strictly applying this law to him and reducing him to a ridiculous allotment, even as low as 250 or 300 pounds of cotton, not enough to support one of his children. When you do that you drive him on relief. I received letters from farmers stating that if we do not permit them to make a living by raising cotton, then they will have to go to relief headquarters and apply for help. On the other hand, those producers of cotton who had not produced the amount that was allotted to them received their certificates and sold those certificates to little farmers.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me this is merely an act of common justice. Either we exempt these people and give them the opportunity to secure a little cash to try to pay their taxes and buy the things for which they have to pay in cash, or they go on relief; and it seems to me the next step is to enact a domestic-allotment plan. I have been an advocate of the domestic-allotment plan for a long time. In fact, my original farm-silver bill which passed the House would have been far more helpful than the Bankhead bill.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GILCHRIST].

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Chairman, at the time of the passage of the Bankhead Act I said I wanted to go along with the Members who represented other sections of the country than mine in an effort to try to do something to relieve the whole farm situation. I am still of that opinion. With section 1 out of the bill by agreement, there is nothing controversial except section 5, and as to that there may be a difference of view and a division of the vote. We should all join hands to help each other and to restore agriculture to safety and prosperity.

Mr. Chairman, in the few minutes allotted to me, I wish to call attention to a thing that will do the farmers of the country much more good than anything that is proposed in this bill or in any bill regarding allotments or production control. I have reference to the lowering of interest upon farm mortgages.

That is a thing that will relieve the farmers generally throughout the whole country. Reduce interest on farm mortgages and you will do more good than by reducing crop production. This Congress should address itself at once to the subject of stopping farm foreclosures and of reducing interest rates.

This particular bill was introduced in the Congress on March 5. Long before the bill was even introduced, and on the 18th of February, as shown by the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the chairman of this great committee stood here on the floor and said that he would bring before us Senate 1384, the Farm Credit Act, which had attached to it the Wheeler amendment. That is one month ago today, and still this House has had no chance or opportunity to pass upon that bill or even consider it at all.

Mr. McFARLANE. Does the gentleman know of any reason why that bill has not been brought up?

Mr. GILCHRIST. I have not asked the chairman of the committee. I supposed he was acting in good faith when he stood here on that day and made the following statement, as shown by page 2112 of the RECORD:

> We had hoped to get it up tomorrow, and in any event we expect to take it up just as soon as we can possibly get the right of way.

The chairman no doubt is doing what he believes to be his full duty to the committee and to the Congress, but may I say that several times I have tried to get this relief measure, which I think it is agreed will help the whole country, before this Congress. We have waited one full month since it was given a preferential standing in this House, and yet we stand here today without action and with no apparent probability that we will ever have action.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me we have been patient long enough. It seems to me that those who are in control of the machinery of this House ought to give us a chance to vote upon this bill. The committee has voted it out. Read the RECORD. It was given a preferential standing one month ago today. Since then we have been in recess on Saturdays and on many other days. Oftentimes we have had nothing to do. We have had to listen to general debate on idle subjects not infrequently during this month. But the Wheeler amendment has not been brought to our attention. Our hands are tied.

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILCHRIST. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. I would like to ask the chairman, who is on the floor, when we will hear from that bill?

Mr. McFARLANE. Did the committee favorably report the bill containing the Wheeler amendment?

Mr. GILCHRIST. The Wheeler amendment was given a preferential standing on February 18. Yes, the committee made a favorable report.

Mr. McFARLANE. Let us draw up a petition and put it on the desk and have it brought up.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. GILCHRIST. I hope this will not be taken out of my time.

Mr. JONES. Well, it is not going to be taken out of my time.

Mr. GILCHRIST. I want to call attention to the fact that on page 2111 of the RECORD the gentleman from Texas asked unanimous consent that Senate bill 1384, which is the bill containing the Wheeler amendment, may be given a preferential standing and such consent was given. The bill containing the Wheeler amendment should properly have come up and should have been debated long ago. I want to go along with agriculture. I would like to join the gentlemen from the South who think cotton should be helped, and I have tried to do so. I also want to go along with all agricultural people, and I have tried to do that. But let us join together now in an effort to get something that will be beneficial to the farm people throughout the whole country. Let us get this Wheeler amendment before the Congress, or the Frazier-Lemke bill, or some measure that will really protect the homes of our farmers from foreclosures and sheriffs' sales.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DOXEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON].

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, in common with all of my colleagues I would like to improve the condition of the average cotton farmer, share-cropper, and tenant.

Under the Cotton Control Act, or the Bankhead Act, as it was passed last year, there was a limitation on the production of cotton to 10,000,000 bales, which limitation was a wise one. This was distributed among the States based upon the average production of the preceding 5 years. The State production was in turn distributed among the various counties. There were discriminations and inequalities, but, in my opinion, the Cotton Control Act has been greatly beneficial to the growers, large and small, in the cotton area of the country.

Mr. Chairman, the bill under consideration proposes to enlarge the provisions of the act that we passed last year in one important particular, and that is by exempting two bales of cotton to every grower. I believe the President of the United States was right when he said, on December 5 in a press release, that there should be exempt to every farmer two bales of cotton. I am going to read the President's statement, which is as follows:

If the Bankhead Act is continued in effect for another year, it is my purpose to recommend to the Congress an amendment granting exemption for the full amount of his base production to each farmer who has an established base production of not more than two bales of cotton.

The Agricultural Adjustment Administration is carrying out that recommendation. The regulations announced for 1935 provide for that exemption. I believe that is just as far as we can safely go. In our desire to help the share-cropper and the tenant we must not injure the small landowners of the country, the man that produces 4, 5, or 6 bales of cotton. While a good deal has been said about the large landowner and the large plantation, I remind you that such plantations are made up of share-croppers and other tenants. The average farmer rather than the large landowner uses tractors. Tenants are more numerous on the plantations. I have heard about mechanical cotton pickers but I never saw one successfully operated. Cotton is a hand crop, and it takes people to raise cotton. But whenever you enlarge the exemption, you take it away, in most cases, from the average farmer, the man who owns his farm. That is the man the President of the United States wanted to help and the man he is helping. I take it he is satisfied with the regulations that have been promulgated by the Agricultural Administration to carry out his promise and recommendation. It would be unwise to go beyond the President's promise—there is danger of wrecking the program.

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

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I will yield if the gentleman will yield me more time.

Mr. DOXEY. As the gentleman knows I cannot yield him any more time.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. In just a moment, I shall be pleased to yield to the gentleman, because I understand his desire to improve general cotton conditions.

What will be the effect of adopting the pending bill to extend the exemption not only to the farmer who raises two bales of cotton, but to the share-cropper and the share tenant? I am not asking you to take my figures. The chairman of the committee has not given us any figures furnished him by the Agricultural Adjustment Administration. I am going to refer to the hearings as to what would obtain in Chatham County, N. C. If you make the exemption to all producers, including the tenant and the share cropper, it would require more cotton than the entire amount of cotton allotted to that county.

I have before me a statement furnished by the Director of the Cotton Division with respect to Walker County, Ala., if this bill is adopted so as to extend the exemption to the share-cropper and the share tenant. Mr. Cobb states that in that county this means that the producers who produced 38 percent of the cotton in the period of 1928 to 1933, received 38 percent of the 1934 allotment, while in 1935 this group of small producers would receive 89 percent of the entire production in the county. Surely the small landowner, the owner-farmer would be discriminated against.

What about the small farmer who owns his own farm and has not paid his Federal land-bank loan? You are not going to be able to take any bales from the large landowners except as you take them away from his share-cropper and his share tenant and from the small landowners.

I favor the exemption of 2 bales to the farm owner advocated by the President and by Mr. Cobb, who states, as shown by page 105 of the hearings, that the exemption of 2 bales to the farm can be administered without disrupting the county quotas. There would be an increase in allotments. In North Carolina it would take 6,115 bales to provide for an exemption of 2 bales to the farm. It would take 8,299 bales to provide for such exemption in Mississippi, as shown by statement from page 105 of the hearings, which I intend to include in my remarks.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend and revise my remarks and include therein a statement by Director C. A. Cobb as to the effect of a 2-bale exemption in North Carolina, as shown by page 103 of the hearings; a statement by Director Cobb as to the effect of a 2-bale exemption in Chatham County, N. C., as shown by page 104 of the hearings; a statement furnished me by Mr. Cobb, giving the estimated allotment necessary to allot each producer in Franklin County, Ark., 2 bales; a statement furnished me by Mr. Cobb respecting the estimated allotment necessary to allot 2 bales to Walker County, Ala.; a statement furnished me by Mr. Cobb giving the number of growers producing on the average of 2 bales and less and between 2 and 3 bales in 1934 in Mississippi, Arkansas, New Mexico, North Carolina, Oklahoma, and Tennessee, showing a necessary increase in allotment in these States only of 753,958 bales, and a statement by Mr. Cobb, as shown by page 105 of the hearings, showing that the 2-bale exemption advocated by President Roosevelt and now being put into effect by the Cotton Division will not disrupt the county quotas.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I include the following from page 103 of the hearings:

THE EFFECT IN NORTH CAROLINA OF ISSUING A MINIMUM ALLOTMENT OF 2 BALES OF TAX-EXEMPT COTTON TO EACH PRODUCER LOCATED ON A FARM WITH AN ADJUSTED AVERAGE BASE PRODUCTION OF 3 BALES OR LESS

There are slightly more than 87,000 producers in North Carolina who would qualify for a minimum allotment of 2 bales. One hundred and seventy-four thousand eight hundred and six bales of 478 pounds net weight would be required to make a minimum allotment of 2 bales to each such producer in North Carolina. This is 31.5 percent of the estimated allotment for North Carolina in 1935.

These growers produced 18.4 percent of the adjusted average production for North Carolina during the base period. We would thus find growers who had in the past produced approximately 18 percent of the cotton in the State receiving in 1935 slightly more than 31 percent of the State's allotment. The allotment to such producers would have to come out of the allotment due to growers normally producing about 82 percent of the State's crop of cotton.

The producers on farms with an adjusted average production of 3 bales or less received an allotment of 95,961 bales in 1934, or 18.2 percent of the total allotment to North Carolina in 1934. These growers produced 18.4 percent of the adjusted average production for North Carolina during the base period. It is thus seen that in 1934 the allotment to such producers was approximately the same percentage of the total allotment to the State as their production was to the total production in North Carolina during the base period.

While 87,000 producers in North Carolina would get an average increase of 82 percent in their allotment in 1935 over that received in 1934, the remaining 102,000 producers would receive a 12-percent smaller allotment in 1935 than they received in 1934, and this in spite of the fact that the allotment to North Carolina in 1935 will be 26,400 bales larger than the allotment received in 1934.

TABLE 1.—*North Carolina—A comparison of 1934 allotments, etc.*

Production range	Number growers or producer units	Estimated average bales produced per unit	Average total bales produced during base period (column 2 × column 4)	Estimated allotment, (1934) (column 4 ×62205)
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
0–239	5,488	0.45	2,470	1,635
240–478	15,708	.80	12,566	8,319
479–717	17,981	1.25	22,476	14,880
718–956	17,447	1.75	30,532	20,214
957–1,195	15,480	2.25	34,830	23,059
1,196–1,434	15,299	2.75	42,072	27,854
Total	87,403		144,946	95,961

87,403×2 bales=174,806 bales or 31.5 percent of estimated allotment in 1935.
North Carolina 1934 allotment, 528,688 bales.
North Carolina 1935 allotment, 555,122 bales (estimated).
The 1934 allotment to producer units with adjusted average production of 3 bales or less was 95,961 bales or 18.2 percent of the total allotment to North Carolina in 1934.
174,806 bales—95,961=78,845 bales increase in 1935 over 1934 to these growers.
144,946÷786,342 bales=18.4 percent of the adjusted average production for North Carolina.

I include the following from page 104 of the hearings:

THE EFFECT IN CHATHAM COUNTY, N. C., OF ISSUING A MINIMUM ALLOTMENT OF 2 BALES OF TAX-EXEMPT COTTON TO EACH PRODUCER UNIT WITH AN ADJUSTED AVERAGE BASE PRODUCTION OF 3 BALES OR LESS

There are about 1,999 growers in Chatham County, N. C., who would qualify for a minimum allotment of 2 bales. To give each of these producers a minimum allotment of 2 bales would require 3,998 bales, or 123.9 percent of the estimated 1935 allotment to Chatham County. These growers produced 66 percent of the average adjusted production in Chatham County during the base period and in 1934 they received 66 percent of the total allotment made to Chatham County under the Bankhead Act.

To make a minimum allotment of 2 bales to each grower who would qualify would require 1,969 bales more than the same growers received in 1934. This would exceed the estimated allotment to the county for 1935 by 770 bales, or 23.9 percent. This would mean that other producers in the county would receive no allotment of tax-free cotton and an additional 770 bales would have to be taken from producers in other counties.

The growers in Chatham County who received allotments of less than two bales each in 1934 in the majority of cases are located on farms with other sources of cash-farm income. In 1929 the value of all farm products in Chatham County was $2,083,052. The value of farm products on cotton farms that year was $656,001, or 31.5 percent of the total for the county.

Of the 2,240 farms reporting cotton in 1929, only 1,152 were classed as cotton farms. This means that in 1929 only 1,152 of these farms received as much as 40 percent of their income from cotton. In 1929 there were over one-half as many pounds of tobacco produced in the county as there were pounds of cotton. Wheat was relatively important in 1929. In that year 1,572 farms reported 10,626 acres of wheat.

To make a minimum allotment of 2 bales of tax-exempt cotton to each producer located on farms with an adjusted average base production of 3 bales or less in Chatham County, it would be necessary to take such cotton out of allotments due cotton producers located in strictly cotton-producing areas where cotton is practically the only source of cash farm income.

TABLE 2.—*Chatham County, N. C.—A comparison of 1934 allotments, etc.*

Production range	Number growers of producer units	Estimate average bales produced per unit	Average total bale produced during base period (col. 2 × col. 3)	Estimate allotment, 1934 (col. 4 ×77139)
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
0–239	235	0.45	106	81
240–478	577	.80	462	352
479–717	512	1.25	640	487
718–956	302	1.75	528	402
957–1195	193	2.25	434	330
1196–1434	180	2.75	495	377
Total	1,999		2,665	2,029

1,999×2 bales=3,998 bales or 123.9 percent of estimate allotment in 1935.
Chatham County, N. C., 1934 allotment 3,074 bales.
Chatham County, N. C., 1935 allotment 3,228 bales (estimated).
The 1934 allotment to producer units with adjusted average production of 3 bales or less was 2,029 bales or 66 percent of the total allotment to Chatham County, N. C., in 1934.
3,998 bales−2,029 bales=1,969 bales increase in 1935 over 1934 to these growers.
(2,665÷4,038) bales=66 percent of adjusted average production of Chatham County.

I include the following statement furnished by C. A. Cobb:

Franklin County, Ark.—Estimated allotment necessary to allot 2 bales to each producer-unit having an average production of 2 bales or less, and to allot not less than 2 bales to each producer-unit having an average production of more than 2 bales

Production range (pounds produced per producing unit)	Number of producer units	Average bales produced per unit	Total bales produced during base period by ranges	1934 allotment in bales by ranges
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
From 0 to 239	113	0.45	51	30
From 240 to 478	624	.80	499	291
From 479 to 717	631	1.25	789	460
From 718 to 956	210	1.75	368	215
From 957 to 1,195	259	2.25	583	340
From 1,196 to 1,434	129	2.75	355	207
Total	1,966		2,645	1,543

The average production of cotton in Franklin County, Ark., by 2,240 producers in the period 1928 to 1933 was 4,602 bales. Of this amount 1,966 producers, each having an average production of 3 bales or less, produced 2,645 bales. The total county allotment in 1934 was 2,772 bales, of which 1,543 bales were allotted to these small producers of 3 bales or less, while in 1935 they would receive 3,932 bales if 2 bales were allotted to each producer having an average production of 2 bales or less and not less than 2 bales were allotted to each producer having an average production of more than 2 bales. Relatively, this means that producers who produced 57.5 percent of the cotton in the period 1928 to 1933 received 57.5 percent of the total county allotment in 1934, while in 1935 this same group of small producers would require 41.8 percent more than the total county allotment.

I include the following statement furnished by C. A. Cobb:

Walker County, Ala.—Estimated allotment necessary to allot 2 bales to each producer unit having an average production of 2 bales or less, and to allot not less than 2 bales to each producer unit having an average production of more than 2 bales

Production range (pounds produced per producer-unit)	Number of producer-units	Average bales produced per unit	Total bales produced during base period by ranges	1934 allotment in bales by ranges
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
From 0 to 239	132	0.45	59	31
From 240 to 478	518	.80	414	215
From 479 to 717	500	1.25	625	324
From 718 to 956	516	1.75	903	468
From 957 to 1,195	397	2.25	893	464
From 1,196 to 1,434	493	2.75	1,356	703
Total	2,556		4,250	2,205

The average production of cotton in Walker County, Ala., by 4,546 producers in the period 1928 to 1933, was 11,042 bales. Of this amount, 2,556 producers, each having an average production of three bales or less, produced 4,250 bales. The total county allotment in 1934 was 5,727 bales, of which 2,205 bales were allotted to these small producers of 3 bales or less, while in 1935 they would receive 5,112 bales if 2 bales were allotted to each producer having an average production of 2 bales or less and not less than 2 bales were allotted to each producer having an average production of more than 2 bales. Relatively, this means that producers who produced 38.5 percent of the cotton in the period 1928 to 1933, received 38.5 percent of the total county allotment in 1934 while in 1935 this same group of small producers would receive 89.3 percent of the total county allotment.

I include the following statement furnished by C. A. Cobb:

Number of cotton growers producing on the average of 2 bales and less, and between 2 and 3 bales during 1928 to 1933, in 1934 for selected States with an estimate for the entire Cotton Belt

(From 1934 Bankhead applications—on basis of 478-pound bales)

State	2 bales or less	Between 2 and 3 bales	3 bales or less (column 2+ column 3)
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Alabama	61,895	49,515	111,410
Arkansas	33,833	32,897	66,730
New Mexico	280	314	594
North Carolina	56,624	30,779	87,403
Oklahoma	30,907	32,940	63,847
Tennessee	22,936	19,733	42,669
Total	206,475	166,178	372,653
Estimate for entire Cotton Belt [1]	518,781	417,532	936,314
Estimated average production [2]	518,781	1,043,830	1,922,611
1935 allotment assuming 35 percent reduction	337,208	678,460	1,015,668
Plus 103,000 bales allowed for making allotments as regulations now read in determining the national allotment of 10,500,000,000			1,118,668
Estimated requirements for making allotments by proposed plan [3]	1,037,562	835,064	1,872,626
Necessary increase in allotment			753,958

[1] Assuming that the same relationship for small producers as compared to the number of applications exists in the remainder of the Cotton Belt.
[2] Assuming 1 bale as average for the group included in 2 bales or less.
[3] Granting 2 bales to each producer unit falling in the 2 groups.

The two groups above do not include the 1934 Bankhead applications covering farms on which cotton was grown in 1934 for the first time since 1927, a large percentage of which fall in the two groups. There were approximately 75,000 such applications on which it is estimated there were about 60,000 producer units growing less than 3 bales and would increase the 753,958 bales to 850,000 bales.

It is estimated that the producer units omitted from applications in 1934 and the increase in 1935 of the number of producer units would easily increase the draw upon the national allotment to from 1,500,000 bales to 2,500,000 bales.

I include the following from page 105 of the hearings:

THE GENERAL EFFECTS OF ALLOTTING TO FARMS HAVING AN ADJUSTED AVERAGE PRODUCTION OF NOT MORE THAN 3 BALES THEIR ADJUSTED AVERAGE PRODUCTION UP TO 2 BALES (956 POUNDS) AND ALLOTTING 2 BALES TO EACH FARM HAVING AN ADJUSTED AVERAGE PRODUCTION RANGING BETWEEN 2 BALES AND 3 BALES

An analysis of the States of North Carolina, Mississippi, and Oklahoma indicates that 130,000 to 150,000 additional bales would be required (a) to allot to farms having an adjusted average production of 2 bales or less their full adjusted average production, and (b) allowing 2 bales to each farm having an adjusted average production ranging between 2 and 3 bales. This would mean that such farms would get an increased allotment of approximately 25 percent over that received in 1934. It would further mean that the increased allotment to such farms would take up approximately 30 percent of the increased national quota for 1935.

A minimum allotment of their adjusted production to farms averaging 2 bales or less during the base period and allotting 2 bales to the farms with an adjusted average production of between 2 and 3 bales can be effectively administered in 1935, and would occasion no material delay in making allotments as prescribed in the act.

Such a plan can be administered without disrupting county quotas.

This plan can be put in effect without serious injury to the established cotton producers.

A comparison of 1934 allotments on farms having an adjusted average production of not more than 3 bales with the estimated 1935 allotments permitting each such farm its adjusted average production up to 2 bales (956 pounds) and allotting 2 bales to each farm having an adjusted average production ranging between 2 and 3 bales

State	Number farms producing—		Allotments				
	2 bales or less	Between 2 and 3 bales	Adjusted averages of farms producing 2 bales or less	Number farms (column 2) times 2 bales	Estimated total allotment 1935 (columns 3 and 4)	Allotment in 1934	Additional cotton to provide minimum allotment
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
	Farms	*Farms*	*Bales*	*Bales*	*Bales*	*Bales*	*Bales*
North Carolina	23,687	14,488	28,480	28,976	57,456	51,341	6,115
Mississippi	18,514	16,075	24,262	32,150	56,412	48,113	8,299
Oklahoma	14,901	15,426	20,396	30,852	51,248	36,662	14,586

I anticipated that it would be argued that the exemption to the small farmer, tenant, or share-cropper would be taken from the large planter. I, therefore, furnished information, not based upon my opinion, or my guess, but I have given the facts as furnished me by Mr. C. A. Cobb, the Director of the Cotton Division.

As I pointed out, if an exemption is made to each producer rather than to each farm, 87,000 producers in North Carolina would receive an increase of 82 percent in their allotment, while the remaining 102,000 producers would receive a 12-percent reduction.

Again, as shown by the statistics furnished by Mr. Cobb, there are 1,999 growers in Chatham County, N. C., who would qualify for the allotment of two bales. This would require 1,969 more bales than the same growers received in 1934. This would exceed the estimated allotment to the county by 770 bales. The result would be that other producers in the county would receive no allotment and an additional 770 bales would have to be taken from producers in other counties.

Walker County, Ala., is not a county of large cotton planters. The figures furnished by Mr. Cobb show that the producers who produced 38.5 percent of the cotton from 1928 to 1933 received 38.5 percent of the total county allotment for 1934, while under the exemption to the farmer, share-cropper, and tenant the same group in 1935 would receive 89.3 percent of the total county allotment. The farmer who has denied and sacrificed, who is anxious to pay the loan on his farm, where he produces five or six bales of cotton, will be discriminated against. Farmers will want to know why their allotments were reduced from the 1934 allotment when the total cotton crop was increased 500,000 bales over the 1934 crop.

The case of Franklin County, Ark., covers a county of average farmers. Those who produced 57.5 percent of the cotton in the period of 1928 to 1933 received 57.5 percent of the allotment for 1934; while in 1935 the same group would require 41.8 percent more than the total county allotment. Some other county in Arkansas will receive less than its share.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. JONES] stated that the Department of Agriculture had furnished him with no figures as to how many bales would be required to provide for the 2-bale exemption to each farm owner and each share cropper and share tenant. I wanted to know the facts. Mr. JONES stated that his information was it would take something like 500,000 bales. Mr. Cobb estimates that in Mississippi, Alabama, Arkansas, North Carolina, Oklahoma, and Tennessee it will take 753,958 bales. Mr. Cobb states that it would take from 1,500,000 to 2,500,000 bales to provide for the 2-bale exemption to the farm owner, share-cropper, and tenant. He opposes it. He states it would really wreck the program.

I have pointed out that the President had in mind an exemption of two bales to the farm owner. We should know the effect of such an exemption. Such an exemption would require 8,299 bales in Mississippi. It would not disrupt the county quotas.

In extending my remarks I am advised that with section 1 of the bill eliminated the 2-bale exemption to each farm owner, appeal boards, and adjustments on account of drought, flood, or diversified farming can be made by regulation of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration. All of the provisions of the bill except that which applies to compensation to ginners can be provided by regulation. I am in sympathy with the provisions for compensation to ginners, but I think all ginners should pay a fair price for cottonseed. The ginners have been called upon to do much additional work, not for the benefit of the producers, but to enable the Government to collect the tax. Ginners are required to give bond; they are required to keep numerous additional records and to file lengthy reports with the Collector of Internal Revenue. They are entitled to compensation. This compensation would be paid out of the same fund that is used in paying the other expenses of the administration of the Cotton Control Act. It is a source of satisfaction that the Cotton Control Act is more than self-liquidating. The processing taxes are ample to provide the costs of administering the Cotton Control Act. The ginners should be paid out of the general funds.

Section 2 of the bill provides for an exemption of two bales to the farm owner, to the tenant, and to the share-cropper. I have stated that the President advocated the exemption to the farm owner. I have also stated that the crop in 1934 was fixed at 10,000,000 bales. As provided by law, the Agricultural Adjustment Administration has fixed the crop for 1935 at 10,500,000 bales. They have issued regulations exempting two bales to the farm owner. Unless the production is materially increased it would be most hazardous to increase the exemption.

Again, section 2 increases the weight of the bales from 478 pounds to 500 pounds. The increase in the weight of the bales would require a larger crop. Large crops mean small prices. It means increased carry-over.

Section 3 of the act provides for appeal boards. Its purpose is to eliminate inequalities and to correct injustices. It provides for boards of three members, one to be appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture, the second to be appointed by the attorney general of the State, and a third by the Commissioner of Agriculture. I believe that this provision is unwise. The Secretary of Agriculture is charged with the administration of the act. If mistakes were made in the allotments they were made by the county committees. The Secretary has profited by last year's administration.

The committees for the year 1935 are elected by the farmers, share-croppers, and tenants. The Secretary of Agriculture is arranging for adjustment boards. He realized that mistakes were made last year. I believe that he should have the right to appoint the members of the boards.

After all, the boards should be governed by fixed rules and regulations. It will be the province of the boards to see that all growers are accorded the same rights and that the same yardstick obtains in all allotments.

It has been said there was politics in the local boards. If the appointees of the attorney general of the State and of the State commissioner of agriculture are substituted for the appointments by the Secretary of Agriculture, there will be more politics. Moreover, the rules and regulations may be entirely different from the other rules and regulations by the Secretary of Agriculture. I believe, therefore, that section 3 of the act should be amended so as to provide that the adjustment boards shall be appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture, and that these boards shall be governed by rules and regulations made by him.

Personally I believe that the Agricultural Adjustment Administration did a good job in the plow-up campaign of 1933 and the reduction program of 1934. Mistakes were made, but all allotments were based upon acreage and production. If the grower was not allotted an adequate production, it was because his 5-year average did not warrant it. The Cotton Control Act provided that there should be uniformity of reduction. If there had been diversification, it was because diversification was profitable. The farmer who had diversified was given 65 percent of his production; the farmer who raised five or six bales of cotton was given the same percentage; the large owner with many tenants and share-croppers was given the same percentage. The yardstick was certain and definite. The acreage and the production controlled.

Exemptions to the home owner in the city and in the country are made in many jurisdictions. The Government encourages the farm owner. The President had this point in mind when he advocated the 2-bale exemption to the farm owner. The Agricultural Adjustment Administration interpreted the President's language to mean an exemption of two bales to the farm owner. The Administration has not waited on Congress. The President's recommendation has already been embodied in regulations that have been prepared for the 1935 crop. I have asked Mr. Cobb to furnish me with an amendment that will embody the exemption of two bales. I shall offer it as a substitute for section 2 of the pending bill. At the same time I have asked Mr. Cobb to furnish me with a copy of the regulation for adjustment boards for 1935. It is my purpose to offer an amendment to provide that the adjustment boards be appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture and that the program announced by the Secretary in this regard be embodied in the pending bill.

Adjustment or appeal boards are imperative. In 1934 there were mistakes. Greater consideration should have been given to the flood and drought areas and to the farmers who diversified. Congress provided the necessary machinery. The Secretary evidently thought that his rules and regulations were sufficient. He set aside 10 percent of the entire production for the contingencies mentioned. It would have been sufficient to have given the small farmer a 2-bale exemption and to have given the farmer who suffered from drought or flood or who had diversified a relatively larger production. Such was the intent of Congress. While the Agricultural Adjustment Administration made a good job of the control program in 1934, it knows the problems and is prepared to profit by its mistakes. I believe that inequalities will be removed by the boards.

All Members of Congress are interested in the welfare of the share-cropper and the tenant. He has fared better under the Agricultural Adjustment Administration than he has for years. In 1932 he was receiving $30 a bale for his 3 bales of cotton. In 1935 he received $60 a bale for his 3 bales of cotton. He could afford to pay the tax and still have his income increased. All growers, both large and small, are entitled to equal treatment. All had been growing too much cotton; the carry-over had reduced the price; it had made slaves of all growers. Instead of arraying the large grower against the small grower, I am asking for cooperation. Let all do their part.

I believe in home ownership. The 2-bale exemption will encourage it. It is justified, but share-croppers and renters obtain on large plantations in greater number than on small plantations. They will be entitled to their exemptions.

INEQUITABLE AND INSURMOUNTABLE

If the cotton-control or Bankhead Act has not been beneficial it should be repealed. The administration should not be hamstrung in its enforcement.

The Agricultural Adjustment Administration has made its program for 1935. It has fixed the production, it has provided for the 2-bale exemption, it has provided for adjustment committees, elections have been held for county committees. It is the most democratic of all regulations. Every share-cropper, tenant, and landowner had the right to vote for members of the county committees. If mistakes were made it was the mistake of the growers and producers.

I am in favor of limiting the exemption of 2 bales to landowners because additional exemptions would greatly increase the exemptions provided in the program. The 500-pound bales would increase the amount of exemptions. The total amount of the exemptions would come out of the national allotment. Some States would have their allotments reduced; some counties would have their allotments reduced; some growers would have their allotments reduced; there would be innumerable complaints. The average farm owner will want to know why his production was cut down in 1935 when there was an increased crop of 500,000 bales provided.

The landlord shares in the exemptions. If the allotment is less than 2 bales the bill provides that the difference between the allotment and the 2 bales shall be covered by bale tags to the tenants. The landlord will be denied his share. No class of our citizens has been having more trouble than our landowners; they pay the taxes; they pay the mortgages. They will be discriminated against under the pending bill.

I am advised by the Agricultural Adjustment Administration that it would be difficult if not impossible to make fairly and equitable the estimate providing for the exemptions. The 1934 figures included farms; they did not include new share tenants or new share-croppers. It would take some time to secure the necessary data. Data for the 2-bale exemption to the owner has been secured. If the Secretary of Agriculture overestimated the amount which would be tax exempt if the bill is adopted, the national allotment would be to that extent decreased below the 10,500,000 bales. If the Secretary of Agriculture should underestimate, the national allotment will be increased beyond the 10,500,000 bales.

In many counties all of the cotton allotted in 1934 would be consumed; other counties will hardly give up their allotments without protest for the benefit of 2-bale exemptions to tenants, share-croppers in other jurisdictions.

The administrative difficulties, I am advised, are practically insurmountable. It is desirable that the tax-exempt certificates be in the hands of the grower by the harvesting season of 1935. If the bill is passed, there will have to be a change in all of the forms that have been prepared; it might be harvest time before the certificates are ready. This would mean a delay that would cause great confusion.

In the opinion of Mr. Cobb, as I have heretofore pointed out, it will be necessary to raise the national allotment of 10,500,000 bales to a figure higher than the national allotment by an amount estimated at from 2,000,000 to 3,000,000 bales. The interest of the cotton growers would be hindered and not helped by the pending bill.

The Agricultural Adjustment Administration has leaned over backward to aid the tenant and the share-cropper. I prefer to follow the recommendation of the President rather than to endanger the entire control act by unreasonably increasing the production.

Mr. DOXEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Tarver].

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] in construing the statement of the President, issued on December 5 of last year, has made the same mistake made by the director of the cotton section, Mr. Cobb, when he was testifying before the Committee on

Agriculture, in that he does not consider anybody a farmer unless he owns a farm, thereby making farmers out of all the mortgage companies, banks, insurance companies, lawyers, doctors, and city folks throughout the country owning farming lands, and preventing from being considered as farmers the more than a majority of the farming population who cultivate the lands but do not own them.

Now, this is a view that may be appropriate to the Delta country of the Mississippi where, I understand, the gentleman owns several large plantations. It may be that in that section of the United States only a man is considered a farmer who is fortunate enough to be vested with the ownership of land; but I am interested, and I think the Membership of this House should be interested if it intends to bring about any measure of relief by the passage of this bill, in the majority of the farming population of the South who are tenants or share croppers, and some of whom beyond dispute, have been ground into the dust in the administration of the Bankhead Act.

I only have 5 minutes and no one can undertake to discuss this proposition in 5 minutes, but I want to tell you that you are in danger of being deceived into believing you are passing something for the benefit of this class of farmers, when you are not doing it, or at least I am afraid that the provisions of section 2 of this bill, providing for this small exemption, will be so construed by the Department of Agriculture as to nullify the benefits that you intend to bring about. Read it, and read it carefully, and see if you find in that section any provision which assures the cotton producer, if he be a tenant, or share cropper and not owner of land, 2 bales of tax-exempt cotton. It is not there unless the Department of Agriculture in construing it shall read it into the bill, and my observation of constructions made by the Department of Agriculture has been that these constructions so far have been against the interests of the little farmer. I can only hope, if the language of this section is not changed, that the Department will construe the language to assure the minimum exemption to each producer, and not merely to each farm.

One word with regard to this appeals provision. This bill proposes to set up a board of appeals. God knows one is very necessary. Some method of correcting the mistakes made by county committees ought to be provided, but the machinery set up in this bill will not give any relief. You cannot find three men in any State who can take the time to investigate and decide upon their merits all of the thousands of appeals that will come before them for decision.

Last year, while they say we did not have any appeals board, they told us we had one and told us to submit our appeals to that board, and for my own congressional district I assisted in presenting approximately 1,000 of these appeals. None of them received any consideration except the appellant received a consoling letter; but in my State, if every congressional district had as many appeals as there were from mine, there would have been 10,000 cases for the consideration of this board of three men, and if you do not provide anything except one State board of three men to consider these appeals, requiring farmers who may desire to appeal to travel, in some instances, hundreds of miles in order to testify personally before that board, or to carry their witnesses that far in order to have the proper facts presented for their consideration, then you have not provided machinery here by which any man who is complaining of an adverse decision of the county committee can secure any remedial action.

I intend to propose an amendment at the proper time providing for arbitration in the county of the residence of the appellant, allowing the appellant to name an arbitrator, the authorities of the Department of Agriculture to name one, and these two to name the third.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, and to include therein a newspaper clipping now being published in the papers of the South stating that this 2-bale exemption has already been made by the Department, when in fact we all know the Department does not intend to make any exemption to the tenant farmer, and its officials have frequently so stated, and some excerpts from a letter sent to me by the chairman of my State allotment board, Mr. G. V. Cunningham.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks as indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The statements referred to are as follows:

[From the Walker County Messenger, Mar. 15, 1935]

WALLACE EXEMPTS 2-BALE FARMERS FROM COTTON ACT

Farmers who produce 2 bales or less of cotton were exempted last week by Secretary of Agriculture Wallace from provisions of the Bankhead production control act. This was done under regulations governing operations of the act instead of through legislation, as had been expected.

The exemption was granted in answer to protests from Southern Senators and Representatives who declared that operation of the act last year penalized small producers.

Cully A. Cobb, director of the cotton division, was unable to say whether the 2-bale exemption total would be taken out of State quotas before they are distributed among counties. "County allotments will be made as before without reference to the 2-bale exemption", he said.

Under provisions of the Bankhead Act a tax of 50 percent of the market value of cotton is levied on all production above 10,983,264 bales of 478 pounds net weight.

STATE OF GEORGIA COOPERATIVE EXTENSION WORKS,
Athens, Ga., March 7, 1935.

Hon. M. C. TARVER,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN TARVER: Thank you very much for the copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which contained your speech with reference to the Bankhead Act and the letter I wrote you on December 15. You are right. I hope you will stay with it.

I, of course, am not a lawyer and have had no legislative experience. But when it comes to the application of the Bankhead Act as of 1934, I am sure, doubly sure, that corrections along the lines I have suggested are necessary, and those of us who can should plead and fight for the small farmer for a few crumbs of additional cotton to come from the tables of the more fortunate—those whose financial status has allowed them to maintain a good base even though they have practically gone broke before the Government came to their rescue.

As to how the 2-bale allotment minimum to producer-units would affect Georgia, I submit the following figures:

The records here show that there were 28,029 producer-units receiving less than 2-bale allotments. There were: 1,228 that received 240 pounds or less; 6,203 that received between 240 and 478 pounds, or less than a bale; 9,016 that received between 479 and 717 pounds; 11,541 that received between 718 and 956 pounds; 41 miscellaneous producer-units that received from less than 240 pounds up to 956 pounds.

The total number of bales received by these producer-units amounted to 36,811 bales. Had each producer-unit received a minimum of 2 bales they would have received 56,058 bales, or an increase of 19,247 bales. I estimate that about 5 percent of the producer-units were not indicated on forms BA 8 and 9, so that there were approximately 30,000 producer-units that received less than 2 bales.

The records here show something over 209,000 producer-units. If my estimate is correct of there being approximately 5 percent not recorded on forms BA 8 and 9, then there are approximately 220,000 producer-units in Georgia. Subtracting the 30,000 producer-units receiving less than 2 bales from the 220,000 would leave approximately 190,000 producer-units that received more than 2 bales.

Now, Georgia's allotment was 875,000 bales. The 30,000 producer-units receiving less than 2 bales per producer-unit received 36,811 bales, according to our records, to which should be added about 5 percent because of those left off of forms BA 8 and 9, which gives about 38,000 bales. So that those receiving above 2 bales per producer-unit received 837,000 bales. This means that this group received an average of 4.4 bales per producer-unit, as compared with those receiving less than 2 bales per producer-unit.

Now if those receiving less than 2 bales per producer-unit were given a minimum allotment of 2 bales, it would increase the number of bales going to this group about 20,000 bales, as can be determined from the figures submitted. If these 20,000 bales were taken from the group receiving above 2 bales, it would still leave to this group an average of 4.3 bales per producer-unit.

Taking the figures I have submitted as to what might be expected for the belt as a whole, it would mean that approximately 360,000 producer-units in the belt received less than 2 bales per producer-unit, though I am inclined to believe that the records would show that this number would be a bit less, since the producer-units in the West are much larger than in this area. (Since Georgia's allotment is approximately one-twelfth of the total allotment for the belt).

You will note that I have made provision that the 2-bale minimum allotment shall not apply to producer-units where the acreage grown to cotton exceeds one-third the acreage grown to all crops, and where the acreage grown to cotton is less than 3 acres. You can naturally see the reason for this is to prevent

small town-lot farmers getting the advantage of a 2-bale allotment to which they are not entitled.

Now I want to discuss the other amendments with reference to this matter. In doing so, I should like to refer to my general letter regarding this written you on December 14, 1934, a copy of which I am attaching hereto, so that you may have the principles that I had in mind.

One of the recommendations made in there is, as you will note, that 50-percent consideration be given to the man and 50-percent consideration be given to the land. With this end in view, you will note the suggested amendment to section 6 to be inserted between the first and second sentences. This is further provided for in the amendment to subsection 7 (a). You will note here that the 50-percent consideration of the man and 50-percent consideration of the land is modified so that injustice shall not be done to a farm which receives a decrease because of the application of the amendment which would bring the farm below a base cotton acreage of one-third of the cultivated area, and also that a farm will not receive an acreage base or production in excess of one-third of the cultivated area.

You will note that I have suggested "(5)" under subsection 7 (a) which contains a plan of appeal that can be an appeal board in reality, an appeal board within their own county composed of farmers whom they know and should know them and are in better position to judge what is right and just in consideration of their allotments. The provision of an appeal to the State allotment board or State board of review cannot amount to more than listening and, in fact, telling them nothing can be done. There is not time enough for a single board to handle such cases, for there will be thousands of such cases where appeals will be made.

On the question of tax-exemption certificates not to be sold in excess of those needed to gin cotton produced tax free, you will note the amendment I have suggested; and to carry out the provisions of this amendment, I have suggested the subsection providing for the tax-exemption certificates to be handled in the county office with the ginners being required to deal with the matter of tax-exemption certificates through that office and furnish proof that any cotton ginned is the property of the farmer for whom ginned and produced by the farmer submitting the cotton to be ginned. And you will note that provision is made for those farmers who have suffered because of drought and other causes that they shall receive their tax-exemption certificates to be sold.

That section 23 is amended in such a way as to so define "producer-unit" and the term "producer" that there will be no mistake as to the meaning of what is intended.

The bill as a whole, of course, will need to be reviewed and worded in such a way as not to have conflicting wording with reference to the amendments I have suggested. With your interest and the interest of others, I feel sure that a workable, livable, and heart consideration, as well as a price-objective program will be developed.

Likewise, I feel the voluntary program should be amended along the lines suggested, since it becomes a basis and guide for Bankhead allotments, and injustices in bases are as prevalent.

With best wishes, and kindest regards, I am,

Yours very truly,

G. V. CUNNINGHAM,
Chairman State Allotment Board.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi has 12 minutes remaining and the gentleman from Kansas 9 minutes.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, in the spring of 1933 we passed the A. A. A. bill. It was a measure designed to reduce and control production of agricultural products. It was a measure designed to put the farmer under the control of a bureaucrat and make him a slave, and that has been the result of the operation. The Bankhead cotton bill was brought up here a year ago and that was a measure designed first to control and enslave the farmer, and it has worked that way. It has benefited the cotton farmer in just this way: It has reduced his production by upward of a third, and it has practically cut his export in half. While the whole world was producing just about the same amount of cotton this year that it did last year, the United States is producing only 43 percent of the total production, whereas the previous year it produced 60 percent, and we have destroyed our export markets.

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

Mr. TABER. Not now. I shall later, if I have the time. Our exports are dropping away. On top of that, this pegged market here in this country has so attracted the attention of foreign bankers and traders that they have come in here and broken our cotton market. Do not deceive yourself on that. That is what happened. On top of that, they have come in here and broken our market for butter, and they are coming in here and they are going to bust our market on other agricultural products. That will be the result of the position in which we put ourselves. A few years ago Great Britain and Holland put themselves in the position of pegging the price of rubber, and our bankers and brokers broke that peg, and the coffee peg was broken in the same way. Why cannot we learn a lesson from those things and stop this whole A. A. A. performance? Instead of just knocking out some of the worst spots of the thing, why not repeal the whole thing? It is destroying American agriculture. A lot of progress has been made on the Democratic side in the last year. At the present time I understand that the President of the United States favors the passage of this bill exempting the farmer producing a couple of bales. I call the attention of the House to the fact that a year ago a bill was passed to exempt the small producer of hogs up to 1,500 to 2,000 pounds, and that bill was killed in the Senate at the request of the President and we were not able to do anything to help out our farmers, who have been ruined, many of them in my country, by this processing tax. I do not like to see people put on the relief rolls as a result of fake relief measures. I should like to see this whole A. A. A. wiped out, instead of thinking about extending it, and I understand there is an agreement that the extension part of the bill shall go out. We should go a little further than this bill does. We should wipe out the whole business. [Applause.]

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, this processing tax affects perhaps more than anybody else the cotton farmer of the South and the textile manufacturer of the South and the textile manufacturer of the North. In my own district, in the mills that the South has not taken from us, they are in a struggling condition, which means a resultant loss of work for employees. And work is needed so desperately at this time. I earnestly hope something can be done to eliminate this processing tax. One of the prime factors in the production costs of the textile industry is the processing tax. The tax represented in 1934 about 40 percent of the wage bill of the industry and about 40 percent of its raw-material cost. Strange as this may seem, the cost of the processing tax in the case of some of the cheaper goods and yarns is actually greater than the labor cost. Call it a processing tax if you will, but it is in effect a sales tax on all consumers of cotton goods, levied at the factory and paid by the consumer at the counter, and this is where you of the midwestern country come in. Your consumers and your farmers are paying so much of the cost. In levying the tax in this manner it has worked out that the consumer is obliged to pay more than the Government received.

The effect of this tax, coming as it did at about the same time as an increase in the hourly wage in the industry, has had a dislocating effect. These cost increases, together with a 100-percent increase in the price of raw material, resulted in a decided decrease in 1934 in the consumption of domestic raw cotton.

Basing my figures on Bureau of Labor statistics for 1910–14, inclusive, the average price of 38½-inch, 64 by 60, 5.35 print cloths was 5.17 cents per yard. Last December this same fabric sold for 6.75 cents per yard, which included the processing tax. This represented an increase of 30.6 percent. The fabric which I have used as an example is that which is produced in largest volume by the industry and is therefore a fair index of the effect of the tax. In making this comparison it is applicable to state that in the same periods the increase in prices on all commodities was only 12.3 percent. Removing the tax, the December 1934 price for the fabric I have used as an index would still be 14.23 percent above the average price of the 1910–14 period. So, with the removal of the tax, cotton textile prices would be about in line with other commodity prices.

Mr. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Gladly, although my time is limited.

Mr. ANDRESEN. Has the importation of cotton goods interfered with the mills in the gentlewoman's section?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes, that is true. Of course, the Japanese importation of textiles, especially, has interfered a great deal, but that is only part of the reason we are having such a struggle. I am sorry. I wish I could yield further.

Mr. ANDRESEN. Can the lady estimate the number of men taken out of employment due to these importations?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I can put that in my remarks later. I do not want to take up the time now.

Although the cotton-processing tax alone cannot be held responsible for the high prices of cotton textiles and the decrease in cotton consumption, still the disparity in textile prices is approximately the amount of the processing tax and even if the rate of the tax is only sufficient to bring about parity as to raw cotton prices, the tax must be regarded as largely responsible for this disparity.

This cotton-processing tax is obviously a sales tax on necessities of life. As such it falls with the greatest burden on the poorer people. In its operation the cost of the actual amount of the tax per yard was far heavier in the cost of heavy goods purchased by the workingman than in the finer semiluxury goods.

You know how many of the poor people must wear cotton clothing, must buy cotton sheeting, and cotton pillows and towels. It is working a tremendous hardship upon them.

Based on today's market figures, the cost of the tax is about one-third of the market price for the commodity. This seems to me to be more than a reasonable share of the expense in raising funds for benefit payments. Certainly it has shown its effect in the reduction of raw cotton consumption.

It seems as if the poorer man must always pay the price.

There has been a great deal of difficulty in collecting this tax. While most of the industry pays the levy with reasonable promptness, there are cases, I am told, where these delinquencies amount to more than the value of the plants. This has a tendency to throw prices out of line and make for unfair competition. It has resulted in the fly-by-night type of manufacturer who leases a plant, fills his orders, and then, when the tax is about to be collected, closes his factory and looks for another opportunity to beat the law. This has had a demoralizing effect on the textile market.

Numerous complaints have been heard that the Government is not policing, or in any event adequately policing, the payment of these taxes. Thus a further premium and obstacle is placed upon the manufacturer who operates honestly and fairly.

I wish to present figures which show the collections of the tax since its inception to the end of 1934:

Collections of tax with respect to cotton under the Agricultural Adjustment Act

Month	Processing tax	Compensating tax	Floor tax other than retail	Floor tax retail	Total
1933					
August		$104,838.31	$2,433,865.97	$83,000.62	$2,621,704.90
September	$869,892.39	106,808.76	9,358,507.91	1,606,799.33	11,942,008.39
October	5,714,906.38	111,800.15	8,839,431.12	3,273,751.53	17,939,889.18
November	5,343,749.04	72,250.02	9,505,287.58	2,405,896.00	17,327,182.64
December	14,540,038.92	66,263.07	12,310,032.38	2,529,500.98	29,445,835.35
1934					
January	11,995,000.26	84,474.05	2,047,225.96	1,252,280.29	15,378,980.56
February	8,115,412.21	97,085.17	815,232.88	202,742.27	9,230,472.53
March	9,081,033.80	107,734.75	296,813.28	68,443.02	9,554,024.85
April	8,725,936.71	102,482.72	306,281.60	64,593.85	9,199,294.88
May	11,570,518.63	104,287.05	265,900.78	55,193.68	11,995,900.14
June	9,756,871.18	128,749.40	196,460.94	49,857.70	10,131,939.22
July	9,965,169.98	127,656.06	166,659.66	22,004.90	10,281,490.60
August	7,853,342.02	68,153.30	108,343.69	15,608.59	8,045,447.60
September	7,285,187.69	108,836.58	101,359.81		7,495,384.08
October	7,833,612.57	116,417.52	69,178.10		8,019,208.19
November	6,294,871.39	115,885.47	65,407.64		6,476,164.50
December	8,233,066.49	114,648.93	45,531.29		8,393,246.71
	133,178,609.67	1,738,371.31	46,931,520.59	11,629,672.76	193,478,174.33

From office of finance officer of Agricultural Adjustment Administration

Have actually paid through Dec. 31, 1934, to the farmers in benefit payments out of processing taxes	$202,500,000
Total receipts	204,800,000
Total expenditures, including administrative and refunds	218,000,000
Straight benefit payments to farmers:	
1933	112,600,000
1934	115,000,000
1935 (estimate)	125,000,000

I cannot speak too strongly of the evils which I feel the processing tax has brought on, or hope too much that the processing tax will be eliminated. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the lady from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. DOXEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KELLER].

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Chairman, at the proper time and place I am going to offer a small amendment to this bill. It is simply this: That last year, when the bill was passed, I was in favor of it, because I believed then and I believe now that the principle involved in this and in the A. A. A. is the only possible way to get our feet on solid ground and get rid of the surpluses that existed at that time.

I believe that has been well proven.

At that time the States of Missouri and California asked for and received a provision in the Bankhead bill providing—as you will find in section 5 of the bill—that any State which had produced 250,000 bales could not be allotted less than 200,000 bales. Frankly I overlooked the fact that Illinois had not been classed properly as a cotton-producing State, and therefore had not its records in shape to receive its allotment. Where the fault of that lies I am not sure. Here are the facts in the case:

Beginning back in 1925 when the first record of the State of Illinois was kept, and back of that for some time, Illinois, and principally the two southern counties of Illinois, raised between 6,000 and 7,000 bales of cotton per year. The small flood of 1926 cut that down to 3,700 bales. The great flood of 1927 cut it within 1,000 bales. It was difficult to get back, because that had the same effect as the flood the year before, and we got 940 bales the next year. The droughts of 1930 and 1931 reduced that to almost nothing, so that we only had 619 bales allotted to that little section of Illinois which had previously raised 6,000 or 7,000 bales a year. I went to the Department and they showed clearly that under the letter of the law it could not be remedied except by an amendment to this bill. Therefore, I am offering an amendment to follow out the same proportion, that is, 80 percent of the allotment, to the State of Illinois. I am asking that any State that produced as much as 5,000 bales shall not be allotted less than 4,000. Last year we came back to something near our original amount and we raised around 4,500 bales. This is not at all unfair. It is exactly what California and Missouri really got for a very large amount. But if we take 6,000 bales, which we originally raised, and take 65 percent, which all the cotton States agreed to, we would still have approximately the amount I am asking for. I hope there will be no opposition to this amendment. I want it to be remembered that I helped on the Bankhead bill, because I thought it ought to have been done, and I think it has worked well.

I thank you.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DOXEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I do not feel like the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KELLER] in that I am so proud of having voted for the Bankhead bill. I do not agree that it has been a decided success. Many of us have been disappointed and chagrined at the manner in which it has been administered. I supported the original bill reluctantly, because of the fact that we had a great surplus of cotton, and because it was conceded that America was faced with 4- or 5-cent cotton. Members of this House were assured over and over again that the

small cotton farmer would not be discriminated against. Something had to be done and that very quickly. Congress passed the Bankhead bill as an experimental plan to save the cotton farmers of the South from 4-cent cotton. Some of us offered and suggested amendments. I offered a suggestion at that time that farmers producing only 4 or 5 bales should be exempt from the tax. I believed that was right then, and I still believe so. I propose to offer an amendment at the proper time to exempt the first 4 bales from this processing tax. Of course, the reply of the sponsors of this bill will be that the Department of Agriculture says, "You will wreck the bill if you exempt 4 bales." But last year when we tried to get 2 bales exempted from the tax, our same distinguished leaders, high-pressured the Bankhead bill through this House. To declare that any amendment "will wreck the entire bill" is not a new slogan for the distinguished committee chairman who is schooled in the art of putting legislation through this House. Mr. Chairman, wreck or no wreck, this bill ought to be liberalized by exempting at least the first 4 bales from this processing tax.

Furthermore, I have prepared another amendment to section 3 proposing to graduate the processing tax under the Bankhead Act. It is absurd to say that the small cotton farmer, be he tenant farmer or small landowner, should pay the same rate of tax as the big plantation owner.

The most pitiable thing in connection with the operation of the Bankhead law, the thing that will make anyone heartsick, is to go into the homes of many of the small cotton farmers, where children are hungry with scarcely enough clothing to cover their bodies. We must take the small cotton farmers of the South from the relief rolls and give them a chance to earn a decent living. My amendment to exempt 4 bales from the processing tax will take thousands of these farmers off the relief rolls and give them at least a fighting chance. I want to congratulate the gentleman for offering this bill. It is a step in the right direction, but it does not go far enough.

Mr. DOXEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from California [Mr. STUBBS].

Mr. STUBBS. Mr. Chairman, in my district I have neither the share-cropper nor the plantation owner, but I have a county that grows more cotton per acre than any county in the United States; and I come to speak for those cotton farmers who are home owners and who have an investment by virtue of the fact they must irrigate; and it is very expensive to produce their cotton. While I am in greatest sympathy with the share-cropper, I should like to state that when you pass this Doxey bill, these amendments to the Bankhead Act, you are increasing the burdens of every legitimate cotton raiser not only in my California but in every cotton-growing State of this Union. I myself should like to see this bill voted down.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) the second and third sentences of section 2 and the first sentence of section 3 (a) of the act entitled "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" approved April 21, 1934, as amended, are amended by inserting after the phrase "the crop year 1935–36", wherever such phrase appears, the phrase "or the crop year 1936–37."

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Is the bill to be read by sections?

The CHAIRMAN. The bill not being an appropriation bill, and no agreement having been made to the contrary, the bill will be read by sections.

The Clerk read as follows:

(b) Section 3 (a) of such act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "Any questionnaire or other method of ascertaining the sentiment of the producers with respect to the crop year 1936–37 shall be submitted in such manner as to permit clear expression as to whether such producers would prefer the compulsory tax features of this act or whether they would prefer a domestic allotment plan with premiums paid on that portion of the cotton crop consumed in the United States."

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts: Beginning on page 1, in line 3, strike out all of line 3 on page 1 down to and including line 4 on page 2.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, it is not necessary to say very much about this amendment. In order that the bill might be considered under unanimous consent, the understanding was that the extension of the Bankhead Act would not be taken up at this time and that the bill which would be for the relief of the small tenant farmer would be allowed to be enacted into law without being handicapped by any major controversy. I hope that the amendment will be adopted.

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

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, in view of the understanding of the House that the bonus bill would be taken up tomorrow and occupy practically the entire week, and in view of the necessity for early action if the pending bill is to be made effective at all, we felt it better to agree to this amendment rather than have the whole thing go over until such time as we might be able to take it up, which time might be too late. We agreed that the amendment might be adopted.

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

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. Does the gentleman's amendment strike out lines 4 to 13, inclusive?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The matter of submitting the questionnaire?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I do not strike that out. That might as well go out. There would be no object in holding a referendum if the act is not to be extended.

Mr. MILLER. Personally, I see no object in retaining it.

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

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. DIES. I will tell the gentleman why it should be retained; we ought to have a fair election on this question, which we did not get last time when they asked the farmer whether or not he would have this or nothing and that if he voted against it he would not get anything.

Mr. MILLER. We will be voting on nothing.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I would suggest to the gentleman that this is my amendment; that if he wants to strike out something else, I, of course, have no control over that. I simply want this one matter taken care of.

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

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. BOILEAU. I would like to call to the attention of the gentleman from Massachusetts, and also to the attention of the gentleman from Texas, that this referendum applies only to the crop year 1936–37, so the gentleman from Arkansas is perfectly right.

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

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. JONES. The gentleman understands that for a referendum no law is necessary. There was a referendum before any Bankhead bill was written. We simply provide here that if they have any sounding of sentiment, or any determination in reference to the crop year 1936–37 as to the basis for any future legislation, they shall submit to the

farmers a choice instead of submitting simply the one proposition.

Mr. BOILEAU. What could they do by submitting a choice embodying compulsory tax features?

Mr. JONES. That is what they submitted before when there was no Bankhead Act. It simply gives them a choice in any such sounding of sentiment; and there could not be any possible objection to giving the farmer a choice if there is to be any sounding of sentiment.

Mr. BOILEAU. I have no objection to leaving it in if it will serve any good purpose. My opinion is that it will not serve any good purpose.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I insist on a vote on my amendment.

Mr. DOXEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield before he does that?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. DOXEY. I want to be perfectly fair and frank. I hate to see a controversy arise about section 1 when the purpose of agreeing to the amendment was to avoid any controversy about this section. I believe the gentleman will remember that all of us thought when we made the agreement that section 1 as a section would go out.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. That was the first understanding.

Mr. SNELL. That was the understanding I had of this agreement that section 1 would go out.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I have no objection to the second part of section 1.

Mr. JONES. That is the way it was reported to me; I understood that all of the first section should go out.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts, in order properly to identify the section after the stricken matter is taken out.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONES as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. On page 1, strike out, beginning in line 3 down to line 5 on page 2, and insert:

"That section 3 (a) of the act entitled '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', approved April 21, 1934, is"; and on page 2, line 12, after "prefer", insert a comma and the following: "in connection with a cotton adjustment program."

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, there were many who felt that when a referendum is taken with reference to future legislation, there should be a clear submission of a choice on the part of the farmers between two definite courses of procedure. This amendment was inserted for the purpose of assuring that that course would be taken. This was inserted when it was thought that there would be a vote on the extension which would practically give it the effect of law when the President issued the proclamation.

The question of extension for 1 year by law has been eliminated. That brings us back to the point where we will be at the end of this year when there is no legislation. This is the situation in which we found ourselves when they took the first referendum. In that referendum the sole question of whether they wanted the compulsory features of a tax act enacted was submitted. Then, when the question last fall was again submitted the sole and single question that was submitted was whether they wished that act.

Mr. Chairman, a great many people have complained to me that the farmers or a great many of them were led to think at that time that it meant the retirement of the entire program; in other words, that they had to vote for or against any program. Now, even with the extension privilege going out they may conduct such a referendum that they conducted just before the enactment of the first act. How anyone can object to the farmer having clearly and specifically placed before him the question of whether he wants a compulsory tax feature act or whether he favors the voluntary domestic allotment program under the Adjustment Act, I cannot understand.

Mr. BOILEAU. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. BOILEAU. Would not the gentleman also want the farmers to have a choice as to whether they want anything or not; in other words, having a three-way choice?

Mr. JONES. I do not think the gentleman will find that there is 1 person in 12 in the South that wants no program. No one in the South wants to go back to the conditions that existed before we had any program. It is unnecessary to have a vote on that question.

Mr. BOILEAU. I agree with the gentleman that that may be true as of 1935, 1936, or 1937, but in the next year or two there may be a change of sentiment.

Mr. JONES. Technically, the gentleman may be right, but there would be so many choices that it might cause confusion. Everyone in the South practically agrees that the conditions demand some sort of a program. Here is a deliberate choice that is allowed between the two main programs which are before the public. Why not give them the opportunity of a liberal choice between the two? That seems to me to be fair, and I do not see why anybody should object to that.

Mr. DIES. If we do not have some provision in this bill, the Secretary of Agriculture may conduct an election without submitting the question of the domestic allotment to them?

Mr. JONES. Yes; he may, like he did in the first instance, and I do not offer that in criticism.

Mr. HOPE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOPE. At the present time there are two programs, the voluntary and the compulsory program, in operation. Suppose that the farmer wishes to have both programs continued, is there any way under this provision that he can say that he desires to have both programs in effect?

Mr. JONES. He probably would have both if he had the compulsory-tax feature.

Mr. HOPE. This is to force him to choose between the two?

Mr. JONES. The Bankhead bill clearly shows by its language that it is merely a supplementary program. That is also shown in the committee report. The difficulty was that the impression was created in many sections that it was a choice between this program and no program. Nobody wants that kind of a situation.

Mr. HOPE. Suppose the vote should be favorable to the compulsory program as compared with the voluntary program; then would it be the gentleman's idea that the Department would adopt a voluntary program?

Mr. JONES. No; they would have both programs.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I understood under the agreement yesterday that section 1 of the bill was to be stricken entirely. If the amendment that has just been offered is adopted and the question is submitted to the farmers to vote for or against the tax on overproduction, the enemies to the whole program, including the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and all of those who are interested in overproduction will spend time and money to vote farmers against the tax on overproduction so as to bring back overproduction. These people are interested in large production; are interested because their profits are per bale. You gentlemen who are interested in getting away from the processing tax or cutting down the processing tax, if you vote for this amendment will bring about a larger processing tax. It will bring about a lowering of the world-basis price to such basis that the processing tax will have to be increased to take care of overproduction, which as stated, will lower the world-basis price in line with prices prior to 1933.

Mr. Chairman, I hope we will stand by the agreement and strike section 1 entirely. It was understood yesterday that we would cut out that whole section. The cotton people

of the South generally, and specifically the cotton farmers of the South, do not want that type of provision in there, so I hope the amendment will be voted down.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] stated the other day at the time the gentleman from Texas called up this bill, as follows:

> Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand when this bill is taken up the committee will not object to the elimination of section 1 from the bill?
> Mr. JONES. That is the general understanding.

This quotation appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Friday, March 15, 1935.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, I understand the 4.2 cents processing tax today is costing the consumer a large amount of money. It is expensive to the consumer. But if you bring the world-based price down to 5, 6, or 8 cents, and then try to maintain a parity price, you will have to increase the processing tax.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I ask for recognition.

It was my understanding that paragraph 1 was all that was involved. I had no thought of taking out paragraph 2 and that is the way I understood the agreement. There were several of us working on it. May I ask the gentleman from Massachusetts if that is not his understanding?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. When we first talked about it, it was about striking out the entire section and afterward the gentleman came to me and wanted to know if I would insist on the whole section going out, stating he would prefer to have the second paragraph continued. I said I had no objection to that at all because my thought was that the question of extension was a big subject and was one that should come up on the floor on its own merits.

Mr. JONES. That was my understanding all along, that there was some question about striking out the entire section, but the report came to me that it was the first paragraph that was involved and after I talked to the gentleman, I understood it in that way, but if I answered in the RECORD as my friend from Georgia states I did, although I understood the gentleman was referring to paragraph 1, in view of the fact the RECORD states "section", if I made such an agreement I shall stand by the agreement regardless.

Mr. DIES. What about other amendments?

Mr. JONES. The gentleman can offer an amendment. I want to assure the gentleman I thought paragraph 1 was the only thing involved, but the RECORD shows otherwise. I misunderstood the question of the gentleman from Alabama, but in view of the situation I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to withdraw the substitute amendment offered by him to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment to the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts striking out the entire section.

The CHAIRMAN. In the opinion of the Chair, that would not be a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. DOXEY. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an independent motion. If it has been agreed here by all the parties concerned and there has been unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas may withdraw his amendment, then section 1 is not subject to any amendment, because we are not considering section 1, and that entire section is eliminated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair may say to the gentleman from Mississippi that the gentleman from Massachusetts offered an amendment striking out all of the first paragraph of section 1, to which the gentleman from Texas offered a substitute. No amendment is pending with reference to the elimination of the entire section.

Mr. DOXEY. Then, in view of the statement of the gentleman from Texas, I am sure, in the interest of harmony and expedition, the gentleman from Massachusetts will also ask unanimous consent to withdraw his amendment so we can proceed with the consideration of section 2.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. If it is agreeable to the chairman of the committee, I will change my motion and move to strike out the entire section.

Mr. MILLER. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts modifying his original amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts: Page 1, beginning at line 3, strike out all of section 1.

Mr. LEE of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to see the cotton farmers have a chance to vote on the question of a choice between two forms of aid. The last vote they had was to vote for the Bankhead plan or vote against any form of aid, or at least they understood it that way.

Oklahoma ranks from third to fifth in the production of cotton. I know how many backaches there are in a bale of cotton. I have chopped, it seems like, a hundred miles of cotton; and when the cotton farmers were faced with the situation of voting for this Bankhead plan, which was the only aid available as they saw it, or voting no, which seemed like cutting off all hope of aid, they voted for the Bankhead plan.

The Bankhead plan has been criticized, but it has helped. We were in an emergency. It needs no apology. A great Government has done a great good for the cotton farmers, but we should make progress, and I hope we do make progress in this matter.

I personally favor the domestic allotment plan.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEE of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I would suggest to the gentleman that if we strike out the entire section at the present time, unquestionably this legislation will be here again before Congress adjourns and at that time the gentleman could offer any proposal he may have in mind with respect to a questionnaire.

Mr. LEE of Oklahoma. I hope to finish my remarks at this time.

Cotton farmers, as has already been said, are in a desperate condition. Cotton pickers for years have been making enough cash money by picking cotton to grubstake them for the next crop. This year they were on relief. I favor the domestic allotment plan, because it will return to the farmer his rightful prerogative of putting in the amount of cotton he wants to. Today I introduced a bill to that effect, giving him a Government benefit on the amount of cotton that is used domestically and letting him produce what he wants to. The price of world cotton will automatically curtail production. No man who knows the drudgery of raising cotton, when he is confronted with the proposition of raising some cotton at a profit and the rest at a loss, is going to raise much cotton at a loss. He may put in enough to have a safe margin in order that he may get the benefit of the total amount allotted to him, but he will not run away with production.

Perhaps you are thinking that he did overproduce before the passage of the Bankhead law, but I point out that then he was faced with the proposition of raising no cotton at all or else raising it all at a loss, whereas, under my plan, he would receive Government benefits on that amount allotted to him to produce for domestic consumption, thus emphasizing the fact that he was losing on the amount he produced above his allotment. The result would be that he would diversify his crops and curtail his own production according to the world market price of cotton.

We are losing our world markets. Already this season we have exported 2,350,000 less bales than we did over the same period last season, and the exportation a year ago was considerably less than it has been in the past.

In order to raise the price of cotton the United States cut down her production, but other nations increased. We re-

treated while they advance and the market has not been materially helped.

I do not believe we should teach Russia how to power-farm on a grand scale and then give her the world markets. I believe we ought to go out and knock on their doors and ask for their trade, and we ought to have an exportable surplus that would give us something to sell them.

We should give our farmers an outright Government benefit on that amount of their crop which is produced for domestic use and then sell the remainder to the other nations at what we can get for it. If we will stop trying to hold prices up artificially and offer our commodities to the world at a price where the other nations can buy, we can sell to them. From the world standpoint there is no such thing yet as overproduction. It is rather underconsumption.

Why, last year 4,000,000 people starved to death for the want of bread in China and India, and here in America we starved because we had too much.

I believe that the emergency has partially passed and that the time has come when we should have a permanent program that will go out and get foreign markets. Then, when the other nations are willing to meet America and divide the world markets, we will be in a better position to get that part of the world trade that rightly belongs to us. If we sell our surplus commodities at a price that other nations can afford to pay, we will thereby create greater markets by increasing the consumption of wheat and cotton. Why, there are 450,000,000 Chinamen. If we could persuade them to lengthen their shirt tails half an inch, it would absorb our cotton surplus overnight. [Laughter and applause.]

I would like to see us look forward to a permanent solution of this problem by substituting the plan of an outright Government benefit to the farmer on his allotted amount and removing all limitations on his production, such as is contained in the bill which I introduced today.

By so doing you will first remove the objectionable limitations on production, and return to the farmer the freedom of planting what he wishes and as much as he wishes.

Second, you will save the expense of paying rentals on land not in cultivation.

Third, you will regain our foreign markets.

Fourth, you will give employment to the millions of cotton pickers who are now on relief.

Fifth, you will give employment to the almost 2,000,000 persons normally employed in the ginning, compressing, transporting, and handling of cotton.

Sixth, you will restore the natural operation of the law of supply and demand and prevent market crashes like the one just experienced, because it was thought that the Government was not going to loan further on cotton.

Finally, you will make the production of cotton profitable to the farmer by the payment of the benefit, thereby restoring to him the dignity of running his own farm.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to see the farmers have a chance to vote on this domestic allotment plan. [Applause.]

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, in regard to the understanding about the amendment, I had the impression it was the first paragraph that the gentleman from Massachusetts offered to strike out. In answer to the question of the gentleman from Georgia, I did not have the bill before me.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] to strike out the first section.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. (a) Section 4 of such act, as amended, is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(h) If the allotment of tax-exempt cotton to land of any producer of cotton is less than 2 bales for the crop year 1935–36, there shall be exempt from the tax imposed under this act so much of the cotton harvested on such land during such crop year as is in excess of the allotment, but not in excess of 2 bales. For the purpose of making effective the benefits of this subsection, in the case of land cultivated by a tenant or share cropper, if the allotment to such land to a person as owner thereof would be less than 2 bales, the allotment shall be made to and the exemption certificates shall be issued to the tenant or share cropper. No producer shall be entitled to exemption certificates on the amount of cotton exempt from tax under this subsection, but, upon proof of the right to exemption under this subsection in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Treasury, bale tags shall be issued for such cotton. For the crop year 1935–36 the quantity of cotton which the Secretary of Agriculture determines under section 3 (a) should be allotted shall include the amount which the Secretary of Agriculture estimates will be tax exempt under this subsection and the amount of cotton apportioned under section 3 (b) shall be the amount of the allotment so determined minus the amount of tax-exempt cotton so estimated."

(b) Section 23 of such act, as amended (relating to the definition of "bale"), is amended by inserting after "3," in the last sentence thereof "4 (h),".

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 22, strike out the period following the word "bales", insert a comma, and the following: "3 bales (if the allotment is 2 bales or more but less than 3 bales); 4 bales (if the allotment is 3 bales or more or less than 4 bales), as the case may be."

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I am not going to take much of your time, but we have been talking about the small farmer and what has been done to that class of farmers, usually with large families, who, because of poverty, are able to produce only 1, 2, 3, 4, or even 5 bales of cotton. Under my amendment we will remedy this situation, and the farmer that grows 1, 1½, 1¾ bales, or where he grows 3 bales, he does not get any more under my amendment than the difference between his allotment and the number of bales I propose to give him. If his base production is, say, 6 bales, and if his allotment is 3 bales or a little more, we give him 4 bales.

The only difference is that the small amount between 2½ and 2 bales is to make it 3, between 3 and 3¼ bales to make it 4, and it would not amount to 150,000 bales of cotton. Certainly this would come from the large cotton farmer such as we have in the Delta section of Mississippi, and be given to small farmers in the hill section of Mississippi, and this would apply in each State. This would help to give to that little farmer a few more dollars that he may be able to pay his taxes, and buy some clothes for his children. It would take away from the fellow who has been getting the benefit under the original bill, being able to walk around with tax-exempt certificates, a large rent check, and a large parity check. This will not amount to what the Department of Agriculture has told you with regard to 2 bales. It is only the small difference after the allotment has been made.

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

Mr. FULMER. Yes.

Mr. CULKIN. The gentleman refers to the man who has title to his own land. He, of course, will benefit by this bill, but what about the man who does not own any land, who has heretofore been a tenant farmer? Will the gentleman tell what his fate is?

Mr. FULMER. He is the fellow that I am trying to help, the fellow that rents a small farm or that owns a little piece of land—a farmer who does not farm like myself, with 20 tenants on my farm.

Mr. CULKIN. What I do not understand is how this amendment which the gentleman proposes, and I know he does so in good faith, reinstates the tenant farmer in a new lease.

Mr. FULMER. It would give him that extra little amount over and above the allotment given him under the program.

Mr. CULKIN. That must be the act of the owner of the land—the landlord.

Mr. FULMER. It does not apply to the landlord, unless he is a little 4-bale farmer, or a smaller farmer.

Mr. CULKIN. So, so far as the landlord is concerned, the situation of the tenant farmer is the same as it was before.

Mr. FULMER. Absolutely, unless his allotment is less than 3 or 4 bales.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. We may just as well have a clear understanding about this matter. If we are going to amend the bill in such fashion as this, the bill may just as well be abandoned; and I ask everyone who is interested in having some provision made for the small share-cropper, the small tenant, the small landowner, to vote against this amendment. The Pres-

ident practically made the statement before the vote was taken last fall that there would be a 2-bale exemption. We are trying to keep faith with that promise; and if you load this bill down with amendments, there will not be any legislation. You will be back where your tenants with 300 or 400 pounds or 1 bale would have only that amount. Are you for that provision, or are you for playing to the gallery? That is the whole thing at issue. There are 2,400,000 producers of cotton. They produced last year less than 5 bales each, on an average. They ordinarily produce between 5 and 6 bales. Any man who thinks this thing through must realize that if we are to have a program we must stay within the range of reason. Do you want a program, or do you want to make it seem as if you want to do a whole lot more and get nothing done? That is the issue here, and that is all.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following substitute amendment for the Fulmer amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute offered by Mr. MILLER for the amendment of Mr. FULMER: Strike out the word "two", in lines 18 and 22, on page 2, and in line 1, on page 3, and insert in lieu thereof the word "three."

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask the attention of the Committee for just a few minutes to reply briefly to some remarks by the beloved Chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, the gentleman from Texas, Mr. JONES. I may be charged with playing to the gallery by undertaking to amend this bill and with wrecking the act, but justice to the host of small farmers is all I am asking by this amendment. To be perfectly frank with you, I do not want to wreck the Bankhead Cotton Control Act. It is the only bill that has passed the Congress since I have been here upon which I made two or three speeches. At the time we were considering the original bill I took for granted that the Agricultural Adjustment Administration would equitably and rightfully administer the law. That has not been done, and the only way to correct that is to put into the law the amount of bales that must be exempted to the sharecropper, the small farmer, and to the tenant. You cannot avoid the human equation in this question. We cannot afford to starve the tenant and other small farmers of this Nation. We cannot afford to pauperize the small landowner and enrich the plantation owner. The Bankhead Cotton Act is, in its provisions, all right, but here is your trouble—it has not been justly, fairly, and equitably administered. They say that this will mean the wrecking of the act. It will not mean the wrecking of the act.

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

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Mr. FULMER. Is it not a fact that with the little renter who does not own any land, who gets 2 bales exemption, it takes practically every bale to pay his rent?

Mr. MILLER. Let me give you the situation. Here is a man who has four or five children in his family. He obtains 2 bales of cotton. He is a share-cropper. He must pay half of that to his landlord. That leaves him 1 bale, or $50, and that is what he receives from his summer's work in producing that cotton.

The Bankhead Act was not intended, and we were assured of it, to penalize that man and put him on the relief roll; yet it has done just exactly that. The reason it has done it is because the great producers of cotton in this country have through its administration been able to obtain satisfactory allotments at the expense of the small producer. They have succeeded in having the Secretary of Agriculture utterly disregard subsection 3 of section 7 of the original law. Mind you, this was the thing that caught us boys representing hill districts and small-farm districts when we were supporting the Bankhead cotton bill. I took it at its face value. This is what it says:

Upon such basis as the Secretary of Agriculture deems fair and just and will apply to all farms to which the allotment is made under this paragraph uniformly, within the county, on the basis or classification adopted. The Secretary of Agriculture, in determining the manner of allotment to individual farmers, shall provide that the farmers who have voluntarily reduced their cotton acreage shall not be penalized in favor of those farmers who have not done so.

Yet they have been penalized, and nobody will deny it. You take the hill section of Arkansas or the hill section of every other cotton-producing State in this Nation, and those men have constantly over a period of years reduced their cotton to the amount that is absolutely necessary to sustain themselves and their families; yet the owners of the plantations in the Delta area have grown exclusively cotton. The Secretary in making the allotments utterly disregarded the law and failed to take into account these facts. The result is that the small producer has been and is being seriously damaged while the plantation owner was not materially reduced and not more than be should have been willing to reduce.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

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

Mr. JONES. In connection with that I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close at the end of that time. This is not closing debate except on this amendment.

Mr. McFARLANE. Reserving the right to object, I want to speak on this amendment, and I hope the gentleman will not make that request.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I want to speak on this amendment also. I think this is the most important amendment in this bill.

Mr. JONES. Very well, I will withdraw the request for the moment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER. The adoption of this amendment will not wreck the Bankhead Cotton Act at all. This it what it will do: An allotment is made to a State of so many bales of cotton. That allotment is then apportioned and allotted to the various counties. From whom is this exemption taken? It is taken from the amount apportioned to the county. This amendment will compel the Secretary to enforce the original law as it was written and the 3-bale exemption will be taken from the big producer, that man who has in the past arbitrarily refused to voluntarily reduce his acreage. This will give to the small producer who has heretofore actually and in good faith cooperated in every movement to reduce the production of cotton.

Mr. CULKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER. Yes; I yield.

Mr. CULKIN. The gentleman believes that in order to save the little fellow, this amendment is essential to the bill?

Mr. MILLER. There is no doubt about it.

Mr. CULKIN. As the law is now, the little man is discriminated against?

Mr. MILLER. He is penalized. He is worse than discriminated against.

Mr. CULKIN. He is penalized and driven into the earth?

Mr. MILLER. Absolutely. Now, I want to appeal to the sense of fairness of the membership of this House that this amendment be adopted. Do not be scared by the bugaboo or the threat that it means the abandonment of this bill or its veto. The President may favor only 2 bales exemption, but that is not sufficient and we must, as Members of Congress, exercise our own judgment.

Mr. DIES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER. I yield.

Mr. DIES. And is it not a fact that the large cotton producer can produce his cotton much cheaper than the small "one horse" cotton farmer?

Mr. MILLER. Yes. The operations of the great cotton producers are highly and efficiently mechanized and they can cheaply produce cotton. They can even pay the tax and then make more clear money than the small farmer can on

exempt cotton. They are the men who have brought about our trouble and not the little man nor the tenant.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The provision which the gentleman read in the former bill that the Secretary of Agriculture should not discriminate against these small farmers who had already reduced their acreage was my amendment, and I want to agree with the gentleman that it has not been enforced.

Mr. MILLER. It has not been enforced. There is the trouble.

I want to see somebody in charge of the Department of Agriculture who does not lose sight of that tenant and that share-cropper and that small farmer—who, after all, constitute the backbone of our Nation. Under the original act these men should have better treatment. They were discriminated against, and I am not willing to leave this matter in the discretion of anyone. I say frankly to you—and I am just as serious as I ever was in my life about anything—that if agriculture is to be maintained in the South, and if we are to maintain harmony among our people, we must give to every class of them, whether they be share-croppers or plantation owners or whatnot, an opportunity to earn a living for themselves and their families. [Applause.] I appeal to you to support the amendment.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I sent an identical amendment to the Clerk's desk a moment ago. When the Bankhead cotton bill was introduced originally notice was served on the cotton buyers of the world to look for a substitute for cotton in one of two forms, either in the form of material that is not cotton, to take its place, or in the form of a substitute field on which to grow cotton. Immediately the cotton-buying world outside continental United States began to look for that substitute. The figures are before us today as to what has happened. The balance of the world has taken our export market away from us; the southern cotton farmer has been seriously injured as borne out by the debate here today, and the Bankhead Cotton Act has failed.

I know something about the cotton business. I know what men mean when they speak about blocking and thinning and picking cotton. I know that 2 bales' exemption is not sufficient to feed and clothe and shelter the small share croppers who rent lands for one-half of the return, who go to the commissary stores and purchase their bacon, their lard, and their meal. So much has been said on this floor in times past about the bad working conditions in the beet fields of the North. Yet we have Members here today who are voting against this 3-bale exemption provision which leaves the cotton-growing family with less than $75 cash income per year for the whole family. If this is not injustice; if this is not unfair dealing to the little farmer in the South; if this is not starvation wages for him and his family to limit them to only 3 bales—I ask what is it? Three bales is not sufficient to protect these small cotton growers and landowners from great suffering, but it is 50 percent more than the bill now provides for, and it is 50 percent more than the President has indicated. At least it will help some.

I know that 3 bales will not wreck the structure. If taking the small farmer and share-croppers off the welfare list will wreck the structure, perhaps it should be wrecked. If the structure is to wreck the great cotton South, perhaps it is not so good to preserve the structure. Three bales' exemption will not wreck the structure from the standpoint of excess production. No figures have been presented to show that would happen, and I am in favor of the 3-bale exemption. As the gentleman from Arkansas has said, it is necessary to make the bill effective to protect the small grower of cotton. It is perfectly natural for the large operator and farmer to claim 3 bales will wreck the structure. Such a plea is always made by the large operator. In spite of what the Chief Executive has said with reference to the 2 bales, and with all due respect to what he did have to say, I hope the House will support the 3-bale amendment to the end that the people down there in the cotton South may use some discretion with reference to producing enough cotton to keep their bodies and souls together, and to the end that a little more cotton may be produced with which to recover some of the world markets. [Applause.]

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. There is pending an amendment, a substitute amendment, and an amendment to the substitute.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I want to strike out the section.

The CHAIRMAN. The only amendments in order at this time are perfecting amendments.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I merely serve notice at this time, then, that I shall offer such an amendment.

LET US ADOPT THE 3-BALE EXEMPTION—THAT IS LITTLE ENOUGH FOR THE SMALL FARMER TO LIVE ON

Mr. McFARLANE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the House will adopt this 3-bale exemption.

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

Mr. McFARLANE. I yield.

Mr. DOXEY. Is this a 3-bale or a 5-bale exemption?

Mr. McFARLANE. The substitute now pending is the amendment offered by Mr. MILLER and I am heartily in favor of his 3-bale exemption amendment.

Mr. DOXEY. That is not before the House.

Mr. McFARLANE. Let us understand each other. I think the gentleman's amendment was to increase the exemption from 2 to 3 bales.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, for the information of the Committee, the Clerk will again read the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas to the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina.

There being no objection the Clerk again read the substitute amendment offered by Mr. MILLER.

Mr. McFARLANE. Mr. Chairman, the amendment now pending would allow the share croppers and the tenant farmers of the Cotton Belt to grow 3 bales of cotton without paying the processing tax. I know and you know that you cannot keep body and soul together on less than this.

I do not know of any reason why this Congress should not recognize fundamental facts. You say "2 bales of cotton" when you know, if you will just stop and analyze the situation, that a man and his wife and two, three, four, or half a dozen children cannot begin to live on that. In the South cotton is recognized as the one money crop the farmer has, and if you tax him to death on this crop you have made it impossible for the farmer to begin to buy the necessities of life. Why not recognize this fundamental principle? You say if you adopt this amendment it will throw the plan out of adjustment. Why, Members in the Cotton Belt here on the floor are winking at each other. We might as well drive the nigger out of the woodpile. If you adopt this additional limitation as it is written in this bill it is going to take some of the cotton allotment from these big cotton plantations and corporation farms; it is going to take a little bit of "gravy" out of their platter. That is all there is to it. Now, let us recognize the rule of right; that is all there is to it, and we ought to be willing to do that. If you do not recognize this principle and liberalize this section some, I predict that it will not be long until the cotton farmers of the South will come here and demand it be done. If you do this you are going to vote for at least a 3-bale exemption, and in the absence of domestic allotment legislation that we are all in doubt about at this time, I hope that this Congress will go on record favoring at least a 3-bale exemption so that this poor tenant farmer and share cropper, who is trying to keep body and soul together, trying to keep his self-respect, and trying to keep off relief rolls, will have a chance to do so; but he cannot do it if you do not give him at least 3 bales' exemption from the tax. [Applause.]

Mr. FORD of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLER] providing that 3 bales shall be exempt to all growers and producers of cotton from tax under the Bankhead Act.

Before adoption of the Bankhead Act cotton was selling for less than 6 cents per pound. Not long after the adoption of the Bankhead Act cotton was bringing 10 cents a pound, and it is now pegged at 12 cents a pound by the Government. It therefore appears that as an emergency measure this law has been a salvation to the cotton farmers of our country, but I desire to call the attention of the membership of the House to some very important things regarding the future of our cotton industry. Since the Bankhead Act has been in force cotton production in the United States has decreased about 43 percent, while cotton production in India has increased about 8 percent; in Brazil, nearly 22 percent; and in Egypt, 68 percent. America's export trade has dropped about 50 percent. The statistics show that during the last 2 years millions of dollars' worth of our improved farm machinery has been shipped to foreign countries, and that those foreign countries have employed our experts at high salaries to teach them how to produce more cotton. I am afraid that we will not accomplish very much if we cut the production of cotton in this country by compulsory methods while the foreign countries increase their production. Heretofore we have been able to export about 60 percent of the cotton produced in the United States, but in recent years our export trade has dropped considerably, and I think we should give serious consideration to this matter. I am glad to see the provision of the bill continuing the act for the crop year 1936–37 eliminated by the agreement of the Committee on Agriculture until we can give further consideration to the matter.

Mr. Chairman, while the Bankhead Act has been of great value as an emergency measure in restoring the price of cotton, it has also worked many hardships on the small landowner and tenant farmers of our country, and I commend the forethought and efforts of my colleague from Mississippi [Mr. DOXEY], the author of this bill, in bringing a measure before this Congress in order that we might vote some relief to the small cotton producers, however, I am constrained to agree with the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLER] and say that it would be much better if Congress would exempt 3 bales to every producer instead of 2 as provided in the bill.

Some few years ago the Department of Agriculture, through the various agricultural colleges and extension agents in the cotton-producing States began to teach the cotton farmers that they should diversify instead of trying to grow so much cotton. About that time a move was started by some of the cattle growers of the Northwest to sell high-priced dairy cattle to the southern cotton farmers, and they joined in with the extension forces and sold the idea to the small cotton farmers that they should go into the dairy business and grow more feed and less cotton. The result was that long before the Bankhead Act was enacted, the small landowners and tenant farmers of Mississippi and every other cotton-producing State had already cut their cotton acreage, while the large landowners, and particularly the ones living in the fertile sections, continued to plant every available acre in cotton. Because the small farmer followed the advice of the agricultural leaders and diversified his crops he found that when a 5-year average was established as a basis of tax-free quota his allotment was far too small to meet his demands for the necessities of life. The discriminations in this connection from which the small farmers have suffered is everywhere evident in the cotton-growing States and we must take some action to remedy this situation and restore their rights.

Mr. HOOK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD of Mississippi. I gladly yield to my friend from Michigan.

Mr. HOOK. The Bankhead bill is supposed to be self-sustaining, is it not?

Mr. FORD of Mississippi. That is true.

Mr. HOOK. I want to secure some information, because I am from the North and I desire to go along with the boys in the cotton industry. I do not know anything about the cotton industry and I want to get some information.

Mr. FORD of Mississippi. I will gladly give the gentleman any information that he desires.

Mr. HOOK. If we allow this extra bale exemption, will the Bankhead bill still be self-sustaining?

Mr. FORD of Mississippi. It will. There will be no change in the allotment to the counties. It will take a little off of the allotment that has heretofore been made to the big producer and will give the little producer, who has been diversifying and cutting his acreage in the past, a chance for a fair allotment with the 3-bale exemption.

Mr. Chairman, by a vote taken last fall the farmers approved the continuance of the Bankhead Act, but this was done because they were given the assurance that their Senators and Representatives in Congress would take immediate action to remove the discriminations against the small producer. I hope we will live up to our plain duty in this matter and vote to remove these restrictions. I say this because I realize that the cotton crop is the only source from which the southern farmer can obtain funds with which to pay his taxes, meet his cash obligations and provide for his family. It is with this thought in mind that I contend that the 2-bale exemption is not sufficient, and I plead with you to grant a more liberal basis than that. A 3-bale exemption is also insufficient, but the force of circumstances dictates that we accept that if nothing better can obtain. [Applause.]

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to call the attention of the House to a fact which I think will interest every Member. In the issue of Fiber and Fabric of December 22 is a very interesting story about raising cotton in New England. This cotton was raised in my own district 18 miles east of my own home. I had the pleasure of watching that cotton grow, seeing the plants blossom, and I have here a sample of the cotton picked.

Up in New England we used to sing the old favorite song about how we wished we were "in the land of cotton", but if we keep on up there in New England we will have cotton plantations right in our own back yards.

Mr. Chairman, I have here pictures which show the cotton plantation referred to. While this was only an experiment, and it was at first very doubtful whether or not the cotton would actually blossom and grow to maturity, it was successfully carried out by Mr. Victor Depres, who owns and lives on the old estate where Eli Whitney, the inventor of the cotton gin was born.

Mr. Chairman, I am very much interested in the legislation under consideration. I think we ought to have an exemption of 3 or 4 bales. Here is some cotton that was picked in my district and although we always thought it was impossible to raise cotton so far north in Massachusetts the experiment was rather successful. The seed was not planted before May 10, and on August 11 the first blossoms appeared on these vines. The lower ones came first, and they matured first. I believe we have to do something up in my section of the country to help offset some of these processing taxes, and I think for future experiments it will be of some value to our producers in Massachusetts to get this exemption, so that they can raise 3 or 4 bales and have them tax exempt. Having that amount tax exempt I think will go a long way to help them cultivate and also to further experiment on this matter of planting and growing cotton.

I hope that the Massachusetts State Agricultural College will take this matter up, and go more extensively into the possibilities we have up there for the raising of cotton, so that we may enlarge our production of cotton, not only in Massachusetts, but carry it into New Hampshire, Maine, Vermont, Connecticut, and Rhode Island. The Chairman of the Agricultural Committee stated awhile ago that there are 2,400,000 small producers of cotton—5 bales or less. In this connection the gentleman wants to add 1 more to his figures and made it 2,400,001.

I thought the Members of the House might be interested in seeing these pictures and in seeing cotton actually produced in my district, 18 miles from my own home. I have taken a great deal of interest this past season in watching Mr. Depres develop and plant this experimental acreage which he has so successfully done.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I want to speak in favor of this amendment and will require 2 or 3 minutes at least.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Chairman, this is the most important part of this bill. After we get through this section it will not take long to finish the bill.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I want to call the attention of my colleagues to the fact that they are talking this bill to death. We have until 5 o'clock to pass it. We will have the bonus bill before us the rest of the week. If the gentlemen insist on talking 5 minutes, they are going to bring about the death of this legislation.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I want to change my unanimous-consent request. I ask unanimous consent that all debates on this section and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JONES]?

Mr. NICHOLS. Reserving the right to object. If I have 5 minutes in which to make some remarks in reference to this amendment I shall not object. Otherwise I will be forced to object.

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

Mr. NICHOLS. I object.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, I offer as an amendment to that motion that all debate on the section and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan to the motion of the gentleman from Texas.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. KELLER) there were—ayes 86, noes 36.

So the amendment to the motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas, as amended by the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan.

The motion, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, in order that a number of the Members may have time, I ask unanimous consent that under this limitation all speeches be limited to 3 minutes instead of 5 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendments which are now pending to increase the exemption above 2 bales will not prevail.

I am one of those who opposed the Bankhead bill when it came up last year. I am still opposed to the principle of that bill, but if we are going to have a measure of this kind, we ought to do everything we can to make a success, and, at least, we should not do anything deliberately which will have the effect of preventing the purpose of the act from being carried out.

There is a very good reason, I think, for providing for this 2-bale exemption, and that is that the President of the United States before the referendum was had on the Bankhead bill last fall made a statement in which he said there would be a 2-bale exemption granted to the small farmer, and relying upon this statement, the referendum resulted in an affirmative vote of about 9 to 1 in favor of a continuation of the act. This is all that was promised. Everyone who voted to continue the act relied upon a 2-bale exemption, but no one had any right to rely upon there being any larger exemption than 2 bales.

Even a 2-bale exemption, according to the figures which have been furnished by the Department of Agriculture, will result in an increase in cotton production this year. They do not have figures covering the entire cotton section, but for the State of North Carolina, which we may assume is typical of the cotton-growing sections, a 2-bale exemption would result in an increase of 31 percent in the cotton acreage this year over last. If you have a 3-bale exemption or a 4-bale exemption, it can very readily be seen there will be a still greater increase.

If you believe that a 2-bale exemption is not sufficient, then it seems to me you ought to take the position that we should repeal the entire Bankhead bill, because the hardships, which are incident to the enforcement of this act, are the result of the logic of the bill itself.

In passing this 2-bale exemption we are doing all that has been promised and all that can reasonably be expected.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Chairman, I have no desire on this occasion to take up much time, and in order to save time I call attention to the fact that I have just sent an amendment to the Clerk's desk, striking out all of section 2.

Candidly, I feel if exemptions are necessary under this law, possibly my friend the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] is correct, and the law should be repealed.

In my candid opinion, Mr. Chairman, if we are to have equality of privilege in this land of ours we should be willing to assume equality of obligation.

Unquestionably, we have definite evidence of many failures and mistakes in various laws we have passed, but one thing remains definite and proven, that at the time the Bankhead Act was passed we had cotton bales then worth around $37. Not so very long ago they were up to $80. The 2-bale farmer was better off with 1 bale 10 days ago than he was a little over a year ago with 2 bales.

I fear, Mr. Chairman, that the effort to consider this bill, dividing us again into classes, which seems to be a popular pastime now, will not only endanger the price of the South's greatest agricultural product, but, as a matter of fact, will lend fuel to the fire which seems to be prone to burst now and again, dividing this country of ours into distinctions, denominations, and classes.

Mr. Chairman, every Member of this House wants to see this country of ours a better United States, wants to see this country a richer United States, and I am sure that every thinking Member wants to see this country a fairer United States and a more intelligent United States. This can best be done by not indulging in the fallacious idea that one may have his pie and eat it, too, and for this reason, and without more ado, when the time comes I shall ask the Chair for a vote on my amendment. [Applause.]

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. Chairman, I have not been in absolute accord with the provisions of the Bankhead law. I favor the domestic allotment plan, but the Bankhead law is the program we have and I am in favor of this bill, because I think it is an improvement and makes changes that will be beneficial and because it undertakes to speak the will of the Congress.

The original act delegated the power and authority to the Administrator to make the allotments. You thought you placed a provision in it whereby the small farmer would be taken care of, but you are here today saying the way the act was construed and administered he has not been protected. Therefore, I favor the amendment offered by my colleague [Mr. MILLER] exempting three bales to the small farmer. By adopting this amendment Congress will speak its will in unmistakable terms, giving him the protection he is entitled to, and I do not believe the language of this act including this amendment will be susceptible of two constructions or interpretations.

This is a step in the right direction, because when we legislate, as far as possible, we should speak the will of this

body plainly and with such positive language that some executive charged with the duty of administering the law cannot place an interpretation or construction that in effect defeats the intention and very purpose of the law. I believe that Congress has the intelligence to say what it means and the courage to mean what it says.

In my district many small farmers had allotments of 1 bale and less. That, Mr. Chairman, means a money crop of $50 and less for whole families. It is obvious that this is wholly inadequate, and as a result many of these farmers and their families are now on relief, as has been stated here this afternoon. If granted a 3-bale exemption it will have the effect of restoring many to a position where they will be self-sustaining. They are not on relief by choice. They have been reduced to this unhappy status by circumstances beyond their control. They prefer to work to produce and earn a livelihood. The enactment of this bill with the 3-bale exemption amendment will restore to many this opportunity.

I am sure, Mr. Chairman, this legislation is necessary. If no legislation is enacted and the Bankhead law is left to the Secretary of Agriculture and those under him charged with its administration, in my judgment, the small farmer will again be penalized this crop year. By the enactment of this bill we take away some of the discretionary powers delegated in the original act, and instead direct how the act should be administered to better protect those who are in dire distress and require this help.

Based on the experience we have gained in the operation of the Bankhead law thus far, I am convinced we can adopt this amendment without doing violence to the whole program. It is not our purpose to obstruct or hinder, but rather to assist, aid, and protect those who need this help. We can give relief in this way. If we deny it, we will add to the length of the relief rolls.

Let us adopt this amendment and then pass this bill. [Applause.]

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] said he understood the President was in favor of this legislation. I do not so understand. The Director, Division of Cotton, and other officials of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration are not in favor of it. On the contrary, they are opposed to it. They speak for the administration.

Now, much has been said about taking the allotment from the large producer and giving it to the small producer. There is just as much reason in saying that you are going to take the production away from Texas and give it to other States as to make that statement. The bill makes no change in the basis of allotment. The same yardstick applies to all States and to all farmers, whether large or small.

It is said that we have large plantations in Mississippi, but we also have small farms, and there are more tenants and share croppers on the large plantations than on the small farms. Mr. Chairman, I would like to exempt 3 bales, but the chairman of the committee [Mr. JONES] says it would wreck the program. Mr. JONES says to increase the exemption from 2 to 3 bales would wreck the program. Mr. Cobb says that to extend the exemption to the tenant and share cropper would wreck the program. I prefer to follow the President.

That will accomplish just exactly what the President of the United States wanted us to do in his statement of December 5. Mr. Chairman, I submit that I am governed by the recommendations of the Department of Agriculture. I have a statement here that was furnished me by Mr. Cobb, the Director, on the 15th of March 1935. It says:

> It is obvious for the reasons presented that in order to allot anything like an equitable quantity of tax-exemption certificates to producers growing on the average more than 2 bales of cotton, it will be necessary to raise the national allotment of 10,500,000 bales to a figure higher than the national allotment already determined by a quantity estimated at some two to three million bales. The result would tend to nullify the effect of the Bankhead Act.

Mr. Cobb is the spokesman for the Administration. I am willing, under the Kleberg amendment, to leave it to the Administration, because they have provided for the 2-bale farm just as the President promised. If you go further, you will have to take it from the 4-bale or the 5-bale farm, you will have to take it from Texas and give it to Arkansas, or from Arkansas and give it to North Carolina in the first place.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I have been very much interested in the remarks of my distinguished friend and colleague from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON]. Possibly if I lived down in his section, with the large plantations, I would take the same position that he does; but I do not live in that section. I see this from the viewpoint of the small operator, the farmer who grows only 2 or 10 bales of cotton, and I know that he is the man who is being penalized in the present law. According to the argument of the gentleman from Mississippi, the little, struggling corner grocery could operate as cheaply as does the big chain store. His philosophy does not pan out. If I lived in southern Texas and had a million-acre farm, like my good friend the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. KLEBERG], I would probably be favoring the same kind of an amendment that he has offered; but I do not happen to own a million-acre farm or have any constituents who do. So, obviously, we do not all see things alike. I have notified the committee that I have prepared an amendment to exempt the first 4 bales, and at least a dozen or more Members have told me that they propose to support that amendment. I appeal to all of you who have said you will support the amendment to exempt 4 bales to support this pending amendment. If we cannot get 4 bales, that now, I regret to say, seems obvious, let us do the next best by exempting 3 bales.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. McFARLANE. If we adopt the 3-table amendment, the only effect it will have will be to take that bale additional off these big cotton farmers.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. McFARLANE. And that is the reason they are howling for it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes; that is the situation.

Mr. LEE of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. LEE of Oklahoma. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON], I believe, suggested that there is no argument in saying that simply because the producer is a big producer he ought to be held down and the smaller producer benefited. I submit that the same argument would contend that your little corner grocery store can produce as well and just as cheaply as the largest corporation in the country. That will lead to corporation and syndicate farming. There ought to be a progressive reduction or allotment even above the 4-table exemption.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. The gentleman, my distinguished colleague from Oklahoma, is absolutely right about it. Unless something is done to relieve the small cotton farmer, we will soon have syndicated and corporation farming in the South to a much larger extent than we now have.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Chairman, let us see what this terrible thing is that we are about to do. What is this gigantic program in which we are about to indulge, which is of such proportion that it will wreck the entire program of the A. A. A.? Do you know what it means? They have suggested that you give a farmer a 2-bale exemption. Do you know how much that is? That is $100. This amendment would give him a 3-bale exemption and would give him an additional $50 a year. If there is any Member of this House who will tell me that he thinks that a man who works in the fields all the summer long to raise cotton is not entitled to at least $150 a year, then let that Member be the first to vote against this amendment. That is all this amendment does.

Does anyone mean to tell me that this cotton farmer, who takes his little children and wife out at sunup in the morning and goes to the field and with the brawn of his muscle plants and harvests the cotton, is not entitled to protection to the tune of $150 a year? If this House is willing continually to go on record to pass legislation to protect the wages of the laboring man, if this House is willing continually to go on record and provide subsidies for the big industries of the country, then why is not the little tenant farmer down here entitled to the protection of $150 a year? Oh, no; $50 a year will not tear this plan down. One bale of cotton will not stop the operation of this plan; and, if it will, well, it is probably time that we started protecting in a serious manner some of these folks we do so much talking about giving protection to. A good average price for cotton is 10 cents a pound. Cotton weighs 500 pounds to the bale, generally. All you are doing is telling that man he can have $150. I will tell you what I think you ought to do. I think you ought to raise the penalty in this bill from 50 percent to 75 percent. The way it is now, this bill really stops the small cotton farmer of Oklahoma, Texas, Louisiana, and the other cotton States from selling any cotton over his allowable; but you gentlemen who have in your districts the plantations of the South, where you raise cotton in hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of acres, plant it with machinery, never chop a stalk of it, pick it with machinery, can sell over and above your allowable with a 5-percent penalty and still make money; and we are absolutely prohibited from it. I hope you will support this 3-bale amendment.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. NICHOLS. I want to clarify my remarks above, wherein I state that I think the penalty should be raised from 50 percent to 75 percent.

I would at this time offer an amendment to that effect were it not for the fact that that section of the original act is not now under consideration, and were I to offer the amendment at this time the same would be held not germane; but I wish to serve notice upon the House of Representatives that before the session is over I propose to offer an amendment to the original act which will raise the penalty from 50 percent to 75 percent. My reason is this:

The small cotton farmer who farms by hand generally tends only from 10 to 40 to 80 acres of land, and it costs him as much money to plant and harvest a crop of cotton on this small acreage as it does the plantation farmer to plant and harvest a crop of several hundred acres, because the plantation farmer plants and harvests his crop with modern machinery, while the small farmer plants by hand and tends and harvests his crop by hand.

For example, say, cotton is selling at 10 cents per pound; the small farmer can make a little money at 10-cent cotton, but he absolutely cannot make any money at 5-cent cotton. Therefore, the 50-percent penalty prohibits him from selling any cotton above his allotment, while the plantation farmer, who plants and harvests his crop with modern machinery, has several hundred acres of cotton to sell, if he can get 10 cents a pound for his allotment of cotton.

Then, by reason of his great production, he can sell the remainder of his crop, above his allotment, at 5 cents per pound, and still make a little money.

Thus, the very purpose of the Cotton Control Act is defeated because the purpose of the act was to limit the amount of cotton placed on both the domestic and the world market for consumption, and as long as the plantation farmer can realize any profit above his allowable, the market will continue to be flooded by overproduction of cotton.

Therefore, I say that the penalty should be raised to a sufficient percentage, that the plantation farmer could not profitably market any cotton above his allotment, and thus put his own at parity with the small cotton farmers of eastern Oklahoma, and other like sections of the cotton country.

In supporting the present amendment, which provides for the exemption of 3 bales, I want to say to the members of the committee that in my opinion this is not adequate. I am of the opinion that there should be a 5-bale exemption granted and in that connection I wish to state that it is not the 5- and 6-bale cotton producer who floods the market with a surplusage of cotton. Your surplusage of cotton, and the flooding of the market, is caused by the plantation growers of the South who dump literally thousands of bales of cotton on the market off of a single farm, and who could well exempt 5 bales and permit a man to earn $250, without being penalized, and still not hurt the A. A. A., nor the operation of the Cotton Control Act.

I therefore sincerely trust that since it looks as though it would be impossible from the votes that have been recorded heretofore on this bill to get a 5-bale exemption, that you folks will, by your vote, stay with the small cotton farmer and give him this 3-bale exemption.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Chairman, I never came on this floor and asked a favor. I am not doing it today. But I am coming here to ask a very small measure of justice to a part of my country that has been overlooked in this cotton bill. I was for the Bankhead bill. I thought it was right. I think it is right now. But when a great overflow paralyzed the industry in my district and then when we had three droughts it cut us so deeply that we were only allowed 619 bales by allotment. I come and say to you that only as a matter of fairness and decency we ought to be given exactly the same kind of deal that was obtained for California and Missouri under the Bankhead bill originally. I am asking that. I hope you will all remember that I have not come here asking favors. I am not asking a favor today, but I am asking it as a matter of justice. I cannot stop a drought any more than anybody else.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLER. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Is not this plan working?

Mr. KELLER. It is working to this extent, that down in my district, where we had three droughts one after another, and a great overflow, it paralyzed us so that when we had to go on a 5-year average from 1927 to 1932 it only left us 619 bales instead of 4,000, as should have been given us.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I understood the Bankhead bill fixed everything.

Mr. KELLER. Well, it did not fix everything.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, I beg the gentleman's pardon.

Mr. KELLER. I have here the official figures. I am not doing any guesswork. I hope when the Clerk reads my amendment you will remember that I have not asked any favors, and I am only asking the same thing for my little spot of cotton down in Illinois that the rest of you have for yours. I trust it will be given to me when that amendment is called up. I hope you will not forget it. I thank you.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired on this section.

Without objection, the Clerk will again report for information the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER] and the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLER].

The Clerk again reported the Fulmer amendment and the substitute amendment offered by Mr. Miller.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JONES) there were—ayes 91 and noes 52.

So the substitute amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs upon the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER] as modified by the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. NICHOLS. Is this vote on the amendment as it was amended by the adoption of the substitute which was just voted on?

The CHAIRMAN. It is.

Mr. NICHOLS. Then a vote "no" on this amendment will be exactly as a vote "no" on the previous amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that is not a parliamentary inquiry.

The question is on the original amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER], as modified by the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JONES) there were ayes 93 and noes 49.

So the amendment, as modified by the substitute amendment, was agreed to.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHITTINGTON: Strike out section 2 (lines 15 to 25 on page 2 and lines 1 to 19 on page 3) and in lieu thereof insert the following:

"SEC. 2. Section 4 of such act, as amended, is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(h) If the allotment basis (average production in the applicable base period) of any farm on which cotton was planted in any year after 1927 and before 1935 is 956 pounds or less, the allotment shall be 100 percent of the allotment basis; and if in prorating the county allotment the application of the necessary percentual figure to the allotment basis of any farm with an allotment basis of more than 956 pounds on which cotton was planted in any year after 1927 and before 1935 results in a figure of less than 956 pounds the allotment shall notwithstanding be 956 pounds.'"

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I offer a perfecting amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONES: Page 2, line 25, after the word "a" insert "bona fide."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I offer a perfecting amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TARVER: Amend by striking out, on page 2, all language beginning with line 17 and ending with the words, "in excess of two bales", in line 22, and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(h) Where during the crop year 1935–36 cotton is harvested on land with respect to which an allotment of tax-exempt cotton has been made, if the allotment made is less than 3 bales to each producer unit thereon, no tax shall be imposed under this act with respect to so much of the amount of cotton harvested from such land cultivated by said producer unit as is in excess of said allotment but not in excess of 3 bales: *Provided*, That the provisions of this subsection shall not apply with respect to a producer unit where the acreage grown to cotton exceeds one-third the acreage grown to all crops."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TARVER and Mr. MCFARLANE) there were—ayes 24, noes 49.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Now, Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote on my amendment that proposes to exempt 2-bale farms as recommended by the administration.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will ask first if there are other perfecting amendments. [After a pause.] There seems to be none.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi.

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KLEBERG].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. KLEBERG: Page 2, strike out all of section 2, on pages 2 and 3.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is upon the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KELLER].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KELLER: Page 3, after line 19, insert the following:

"SEC. 3. Section 5 (a) of such act as amended is amended by inserting before the period at the end of the first sentence thereof a colon and the following:

"'*Provided further*, That no State shall receive an allotment for any crop year beginning with the year 1935–36 of less than 4,000 bales of cotton if during any one of the 10 crop years prior to the crop year 1935–36 the production of such State equaled 5,000 bales.'"

Mr. DOXEY. Mr. Chairman, I think the amendment is subject to a point of order, but I want to give every consideration in the world to those States which would be protected by this amendment.

Will the amendment affect the program in any way? I know a point of order would lie because we are not trying to amend section 5, but I do not want to make the point of order if by so doing it will work a grave injustice on any State.

Mr. KELLER. It would do a great injury to my district.

Mr. DOXEY. In view of the statement of the gentleman from Illinois, I withdraw my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. Section 6 of such act, as amended (relating to allotments to producers), is amended by inserting "(a)" before the first sentence thereof, and by inserting at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(b) (1) The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to establish, as soon as practicable, in each cotton-producing State, a board to be known as the 'Allotment Appeals Board', which shall consist of a representative of the Department of Agriculture designated by the Secretary, and, with the consent of the State, a person designated by the attorney general of the State, and a person designated by the secretary of agriculture of the State.

"(2) Subject to such rules and regulations as the Allotment Appeals Board may prescribe relating to the time, place, and manner of hearing and disposing of appeals, any producer of cotton (including any share-cropper or tenant) who has been granted an allotment by, or whose application for an allotment has been denied by, the county committee, may appeal to such Appeals Board from the action of the county committee. The Appeals Board shall consider such appeal and, on the basis of the law and facts, shall affirm, modify, or set aside the action of the county committee. The decision of the Appeals Board shall be final and the Secretary of Agriculture shall make provisions for carrying out such final decisions.

"(3) The members of the Appeals Board shall be allowed compensation at the rate of $10 per day while actually engaged in the work of the Board, except that the representative of the United States Department of Agriculture shall be paid such compensation as the Secretary may fix. Subject to the approval of the Secretary of Agriculture, the Appeals Board may appoint such clerical and stenographic assistants as may be necessary and may incur such expenses as may be necessary. An itemized statement of salaries and other expenses so incurred shall be submitted to the Secretary of Agriculture at such times as he may require and shall, when allowed by him, be paid out of moneys available for administrative expenses under this act.

"(c) A list containing the name, address, and amount of the allotment of cotton to each producer in each county for the crop year 1935–36 shall be made public in such county."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 4, line 6, after the word "State", insert:

"The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to establish such additional appeals boards as he finds necessary in any State and to fix the geographical jurisdiction of the respective boards in such State."

Page 4, line 22, strike out the word "provisions" and insert in lieu thereof the word "provision."

Page 5, line 6, strike out "and stenographic" and insert in lieu thereof "stenographic, and other."

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the committee amendments to state my opposition to section 3. I have no desire to detain the Committee except to say that I understand some injustice and some inequalities were made by the county boards last year and that the object of this section of the bill is to remove them this year and to provide for an appeals board. I am in sympathy with this purpose, but inasmuch as the administration of this act is under the Secretary of Agriculture, if any material feature is taken out of the hands of the Secretary of Agriculture and put into the hands of the State governments or

some agency of the State governments, we are likely to get more inefficient administration and more injustice than we had last year.

My understanding is that the inequalities of the act last year are being remedied by boards that are now being set up by the Secretary of Agriculture. If we adopt this amendment, instead of authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to appoint the members of these boards and provide for the appointment of somebody who is recommended by the Attorney General of the State of Texas, and some person recommended by the commissioner of agriculture of the State of Georgia or Texas, who may not be in sympathy with this act, we are hamstringing the administration of the act and we may get more injustices than we have had. I think it is doubtful if we can remedy these inequalities or remove politics by putting it into the hands of State administrations rather than leaving it in the hands of the Secretary of Agriculture; and at the proper time I shall offer an amendment which has for its purpose the appointment of the members of these boards by the Secretary of Agriculture. He appoints all other officials charged with the administration of the control act, and I think that to charge him with a part of the administration of the act and leave the balance of the administration of the act to the attorneys general of the States affected is likely to cause more injustice and more inefficiency in the administration of the act, and more inequalities than we met with last year. I am just afraid that by putting a part of this administration in the hands of the officials of the State, taking it out of the hands of the Secretary of Agriculture, we will be paving the way for more inefficiency.

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. Would it not be better if we had local field boards for each county?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. My understanding is that the Department of Agriculture, in response to the gentleman's suggestion, has already provided for the election this year of the county committees, giving the farmer, share-croppers, and tenants the right to vote for them. The Department has also set up and is prepared to set up these appeal or adjustment boards. I favor the principle of this bill in this respect. If we take this matter out of the hands of the Agriculture Department and put it in the hands of the attorney general of the State or the secretary of agriculture who will appoint their political friends, we are likely to get more politics than we had last year. For this and other reasons, we should leave the administration of this matter to the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. FULMER. I may say the Secretary in the administration of this act stated to the committee that he was going to appoint the same people who, in the first instance, passed upon these things, and the farmer just as well not go anywhere to ask for an appeal.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I understand they are going to appoint men with qualifications similar to the qualifications the men had last year. For instance, if in Illinois they had a drought and flood, that board was restricted by rules and regulations adopted last year by the Department. Any board that is appointed will have to be governed by rules and regulations, and I respectfully submit that the Department of Agriculture, with the benefit of last year's experience, is better qualified than the attorney general in Illinois, or any other State, or even the secretaries of agriculture of the various States, because some of them are opposed to the act.

My thought is that we shall have adjustment or appeal boards, and the members ought to be familiar with this act. The Secretary of Agriculture, if he is responsible for the success of this act, ought to have the right to name these boards, and if does name them and restricts them by rules and regulations, he has the responsibility. If the bill is passed, the appointees of the attorney general and commissioner of agriculture could adopt rules that would nullify the program, and we would thus wreck the act with a vengeance.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, may I state that in the administration of the Bankhead control bill last year, it was largely through the extension service and the allotment board that farmers had the right of appeal, this board being composed of the same people and not a single person thereon being appointed by anyone else except the Secretary of Agriculture, they were unable to secure any results or get relief.

If there is any other way whereby we might be able to select a disinterested board to which farmers may appeal so as to be able to get rid of discriminations and the acts of the allotment committee, that would be perfectly satisfactory to me. Some of these allotment committees gave themselves and their relatives and friends large allotments at the expense of other farmers and the little farmer who had no chance to get a fair allotment. When the farmers appealed, they had to go to the same people who spoke the same language and who belong to the same organization, so to speak. Why should the secretary of agriculture of South Carolina or the attorney general of South Carolina appoint somebody that would want to wreck the whole program? The object is to appoint somebody to see to it that fair treatment is given to each one who files an appeal. If we have a disinterested board appointed by the secretary of agriculture and the attorney general in the State we may rest assured that the county allotment committees and those who have charge of the program will be fair because they will know that there is a board which complaints can be filed with that will uncover any errors as well as discrimination. I hope that the committee amendment will be agreed to, because it is one of the most important parts of the bill and will result in a square deal being given to the farmers down in the cotton South.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McCLELLAN to the committee amendment: In line 8, after the words "appeal boards", insert the following: "In the manner hereinabove provided."

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of the committee amendment is to amend the bill as originally drawn as to that part of it which provides for the establishment of additional appeal boards if the Secretary of Agriculture finds it necessary. The bill provides that one State appeal board shall be established. This merely says if any more are established by the Administrator—and I think they will be necessary, for I do not think one appeal board can possibly expedite all the work which will come before it without making arbitrary decisions—that all of the appeal boards which are set up by the Secretary of Agriculture should be established in the same manner.

Mr. JONES. I do not think there is any objection to the amendment. I may say to the gentleman that we discussed whether we would have representatives or additional appeal boards, and we expect them to be selected in the manner set out. That just clarifies the matter.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is upon the amendment to the committee amendment as offered by the gentleman from Arkansas.

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment as amended.

The committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman. I reserve the right to object. I desire at least 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto

close in 15 minutes, and that speeches hereafter on this section and all amendments thereto be limited to 3 minutes.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I am not going to object, but I have an amendment to offer. I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

Mr. MICHENER. Does the gentleman expect to finish the bill this afternoon?

Mr. JONES. We certainly do.

Mr. MICHENER. How long does the gentleman expect to take to finish the bill?

Mr. JONES. We expect to finish in a little while. I do not think there is much of a controversial nature hereafter. There are just two more sections.

Mr. MICHENER. If this request is granted, will the gentleman close debate on all the rest of the bill very shortly?

Mr. JONES. Within a reasonable time. I will do my best and will make it just as short as I can.

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

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object this is a very important bill. I know the committee has worked hard on it, but some of the rest of us think we have just as important ideas to express here as the gentlemen of the committee.

I do not want to object, but I cannot see that it matters if we take a couple of extra hours in order to consider the problem of the farmers of this country. If it is going to take until midnight to finish this bill, why not let us work on it and finish it? It is not necessary to pass it in the next 30 minutes, and unless those of us who have amendments to offer are recognized I shall object.

Mr. MICHENER. Regular order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto be limited to 15 minutes, and that all remarks be limited to 3 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JOHNSON of Texas: On page 4, line 6, after the word "secretary" insert the words "or commissioner."

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, there is no objection to the amendment. I think it is a proper one.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TARVER: On page 3, line 24, strike out all of section 3, beginning with the words "the Secretary of Agriculture" in line 24, down to and including the word "act" in line 8, on page 5, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Where the producer and the Secretary of Agriculture or his authorized agents cannot agree upon the base acreage and/or production, the producer shall have the right of appeal to an arbitration committee of three producers within his county or parish, one member of which to be selected by the complaining producer, one member by the Secretary or his authorized agents, and the third member by the other two members. If the two members selected cannot agree upon the third member within 10 days from their appointment, the third member shall be appointed by the local official or official of such county or parish whose office has jurisdiction over county or parish finances. The arbitration committee shall provide for an open hearing within 10 days after completion of its membership, shall hear all material evidence offered, and shall decide the issue within 5 days after the hearings are completed. Members of said committee shall serve without charge to the Agricultural Adjustment Administration. The findings of the committee shall be final."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, if I may have the attention of my colleagues for a moment, I am seeking to provide by this amendment for local arbitration in the county where the producer resides, 1 arbitrator to be appointed by the producer, 1 by the Secretary of Agriculture or his agent, and these 2 to select another, with certain provisions made for the selection of a third in the event they cannot agree. The entire procedure is to be had without any expense to the Agricultural Adjustment Administration.

If you set up an appeals board located at the State agricultural college, State capital, or elsewhere distant from most of the farmers of your State, it naturally follows that a great many of the farmers will never be able to present their appeals. They cannot go that distance and carry their witnesses with them and undertake to present their case to such an appeal board. No one or two or three appeals boards could possibly hear the thousands of appeals that would arise in any State. Last year, as I stated to the House, there would have been at least 10,000 appeals in my own State of Georgia.

I am seeking to provide a simplified procedure here without any expense to anybody, the Government or anybody else, by which a man's own neighbors within his county may hear the evidence in his case and arrive at a decision which shall be final.

It seems to me there can be no reasonable objection to this amendment. The other procedure you have provided for in this long section as now amended provides for stenographers and clerical help and the establishment, perhaps, at the State capital or elsewhere in the State of a number of boards the members of which shall get $10 a day. The Lord only knows how much expenditure will be occasioned by this procedure. All that is certain is that the farmer will not get anything out of it except a letter, after about 60 days, in which they will tell him nothing can be done about his case. If you want to do anything for the farmer, if you want to give him an opportunity to have a review of the decision of the county committee by people who will hear the case on its merits, and give a decision in a reasonable time, let him have this arbitration procedure which, as I have said, is simple and inexpensive.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. STUBBS. Mr. Chairman, the acceptance of this amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia covers practically the amendment I had intended to offer. So I shall not offer my amendment at this time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, after line 19, insert the following:

"SEC. 3. Section 4 of such act, as amended, is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(i) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (a) of this section, the rates of tax on cotton harvested during the crop year 1935–36 shall be as follows: '"

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, sufficient has been read of the amendment offered to show that it is subject to a point of order for two reasons. In the first place, we have passed the section, and in the second place it is not germane to the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I admit, Mr. Chairman, that a point of order will lie against this amendment, but I certainly hope the gentleman will not insist on his point of order. The gentleman certainly will reserve his point of order.

Mr. JONES. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it will be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. The purpose of this proposed amendment is to provide for a graduated exemption tax. It proposes to insert a provision in the bill that would give the little fellow a break, so that the farmer growing under 6 bales would pay a small processing tax under the Bankhead bill. Those farmers raising over 6 but under 11 bales would pay a larger tax, and so on. Of those who write me their objections to the Bankhead bill, more complain about the injustice of the processing tax than any other provision of the law. There is no reason why a farmer growing 6 bales or less should pay the same processing tax as the one who produces 600 bales or more. Unless we do something along this line to relieve the small cotton farmer, we are going to have more corporation cotton growing in the

South, and more and more the little fellow will be squeezed out.

The Johnson amendment is as follows:

Amendment by Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma: Page 3, after line 19, insert the following:

"SEC. 3. Section 4 of such act, as amended, is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(i) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (a) of this section, the rates of tax on cotton harvested during the crop year 1935–1936 shall be as follows:

"'(1) On the amount of cotton in excess of the allotment harvested on any farm the allotment to which is not more than six bales, 10 percent of the average central market price per pound of lint cotton, but not less than 1 cent per pound;

"'(2) On the amount of cotton in excess of the allotment harvested on any farm the allotment to which is more than 6 bales but less than 11 bales, 20 percent of the average central market price per pound of lint cotton, but not less than 2 cents per pound;

"'(3) On the amount of cotton in excess of 50 bales harvested on any farm, regardless of the amount of the allotment to such farm, 75 percent of the average central market price per pound of lint cotton, but not less than 10 cents per pound; and

"'(4) In all other cases the rate provided in subsection (a) shall apply.'"

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. WHITTINGTON: Strike out lines 34 and 35 on page 3, and lines 1 to 10 on page, 4, and insert the following:

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, the language the amendment proposes to strike out has already been stricken from the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. That language has been stricken out, and new matter has been inserted in lieu of that language.

Mr. McFARLANE. I make the point of order that the language is not germane to the point of the bill at which it is ordered.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Do I understand that section 3 down to and including line 10 has been stricken out?

Mr. TARVER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair calls attention to the fact that the amendment adopted was offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER], and begins at line 24 on page 3 and goes through line 8 on page 5. The Chair sustains the point of order and recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, then I offer this as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair cannot entertain an amendment of that character after action has been taken by the committee. A motion to strike out an amendment already adopted would have to come upon a request for a special vote in the House after the Committee goes back into the House. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment on the desk which was directed at a portion of the bill which has been striken out by the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER]. I ask unanimous consent that the RECORD may show my proposed amendment having been filed for that purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection the proposed amendment of the gentleman from Oklahoma, will be printed in the RECORD.

There was no objection.

The proposed amendment of Mr. NICHOLS is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. NICHOLS: Page 4, line 1 insert before the word "cotton", "congressional district of each", and at line 4 after the first comma strike out all language down to and including the period in line 6, and insert, in lieu thereof, the following: "and a member selected by the Governor of said State, and a member selected by the agricultural division of the State government."

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Chairman, I have just received unanimous consent from the House to have incorporated in the RECORD an amendment which I had on the Clerk's desk, which amendment was directed at section 3 of the bill, wherein there was provided one appeal board for each State.

I realize, as does everyone else who has had any connection with and seen in operation the Bankhead Act in the past year, that there is a great necessity for some method of appeal from the rulings of the local county committees; but I also am aware that a three-man board, acting for the whole State, could not, by any stretch of the imagination, adequately take care of the appeals that would come to them. Therefore, my amendment provided for the creation of a three-man appeal board in each congressional district of each of the cotton-producing States. Before the consideration of my amendment was reached, there was adopted an amendment to section 3 which provided for the creation of a local board of arbitration. I supported, of course, this amendment—not because I thought it was adequate, but because I figured we would be able to get nothing better, and by the adoption of that amendment, the amendment which I proposed will be held on a point of order as not being germane.

Thus, my reason for requesting unanimous consent to extend my remarks in explanation of why my amendment was never reached for consideration after it is shown by its inclusion in the RECORD that it was on the Clerk's desk.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I expect to make a request when we get into the House that all Members may extend their remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. MASSINGALE. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MASSINGALE: Amend subsection (a) of section 7 of the act of April 21, 1934, known as "Public, No. 169", by adding a new paragraph numbered paragraph 4 following paragraph 3 of said subsection (a) as follows:

"Upon determining the allotment to any farm, the Secretary of Agriculture shall consider the class of the land as to productivity, and shall not permit discrimination in the amount of allotted cotton between similar producing lands in any locality or in any county."

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order.

Mr. MASSINGALE. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry I have not the original act here so that I may show the pertinency of this amendment. This proposed amendment therefore might not appear pertinent without that, though I can explain it briefly in this way. The practical operation of the Bankhead Law down in our country is this. The appraisers will go out to a man's farm—and I shall give you a concrete illustration: I know of two instances in which there is only a turned row between two farms. The land is exactly alike. One farmer was allowed his claim on the basis of a lint production of 300 pounds to the acre and another man just a step from him, just a row, was allowed 150 pounds per acre. That means that one man gets $3 per acre on the land that he leaves out of cultivation while the other man gets $1.50. There is no difference at all in the productivity of the land or in its general farm value. They simply observe the land, and they just take a fellow's word for it. If one man will tell them that his land will produce 300 pounds of lint per acre, in the practical operation of this bill as it now is, they take his word for it, while if the other fellow tells them the truth about it and says that his land makes only 150 pounds of lint per acre, he gets $1.50 in parity for having told the truth. This amendment simply provides that the land should be classified according to its productivity, and that the Secretary shall not permit discrimination in the amount of allotted cotton between similar producing lands in any locality or in any county.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that this is a proposal to amend section 7 of the act of April 21, 1934. Section 7 is not involved in this proposed bill. The amendment, therefore, is not germane.

Mr. MASSINGALE. Mr. Chairman, I confess that I do not know so much about parliamentary rules and holdings, but last week, if the precedent is worth anything, under similar circumstances, in the amendment to the H. O. L. C., we had three acts under consideration, and every amendment we offered to those acts was held to be pertinent and

germane. This goes to the act that this amendment is seeking to correct.

Mr. DIES. In the case of those two farmers, did one have seniority over the other?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. LANHAM). The Chair will say that that bill was much broader in scope than the present bill. Section 7 of the act of April 21, 1934, is not touched in the pending bill, and the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma would not be germane. The Chair is forced to sustain the point of order.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TARVER: Amend on page 5, line 12, by adding a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 4. Section 7 (a) of such act is amended by inserting after subsection 3 thereof the following: 'or (4). A percentage of the sum of the average annual cotton production of the portion(s) of the farm operated as producer-unit(s) thereon, after giving 50 percent credit to the acreage and cotton production thereon and 50 percent credit to the acreage and cotton production of any other farm(s) or part(s) thereof previously owned, rented, share-cropped, or controlled by the same producer(s) for a fair representative period: *Provided*, Any increase in acreage of a producer-unit because of the application of this provision shall not be permissible as a base in excess of one-third of the cultivated area for the crop year for which tax-exemption certificates are applied.'"

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane. This section does not deal with allotments but with the method of appeal from allotments, and the section which makes allotments to individuals is not involved in this, except by way of appeal; not the actual schedules themselves.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, may I say that I concede the point of order, although I regret that the gentleman from Texas is directing it. I feel that this subject matter ought to be dealt with in this bill.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. LANHAM). The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FULMER: On page 5, line 13, after the word "name", strike out the word "address."

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I see no objection to that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma: Page 5, strike out all of lines 13 to 16, both inclusive.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 4. Section 9 (d) of such act, as amended (relating to transfer of exemption certificates), is amended by inserting after the first sentence thereof the following new sentence: "No rule or regulation of the Secretary of Agriculture shall prohibit the transfer or assignment by a cotton producer of certificates issued or reissued to him if such transfer or assignment is to another cotton producer who is a resident of the same State."

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section conclude in 7 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, in the short time that I have I shall not attempt to discuss the provisions of this bill, but I wish to call attention to the Membership, and especially my colleagues from the South, that we may be treading on dangerous ground by continually attempting to pass legislation affecting cotton. In the last session of Congress we passed the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and this act provided a processing tax of 4.2 cents a pound upon all cotton processed. The imposition of this tax means that on all carded yarns the manufacturer paid a tax equivalent to 5 cents a pound and that on all combed yarns practically 6 cents a pound was paid on account of the 4.2 cents on the cotton and the waste incurred in the manufacture.

Now, on cotton's chief competitor—rayon—there is no tax. Rayon is made from 70 percent wood pulp and 30 percent linters. The cost of the raw material is nothing like the cost of cotton. In 1920, 9,000,000 pounds of rayon was manufactured in the United States. In the year 1935, I am informed that something in excess of 225,000,000 pounds were manufactured. Two hundred and twenty-five million pounds of rayon fiber is equivalent to nearly 700,000 bales of staple cotton. The world production of rayon last year was approximately the equivalent of 1,200,000 bales of cotton. In the United States alone a great many articles that used to be made out of cotton, such as paper tape, towels, paper bags, and many other articles formerly used that were made out of cotton, were made out of substitutes; and the entire amount of all these manufactured articles and cloths used the equivalent of over 2,000,000 bales of cotton.

In the last few years you have noticed, no doubt, that in many instances wearing apparel made out of rayon can be purchased cheaper than the same class of goods made out of cotton in the stores. I call this to your attention, and especially you gentlemen from the South, that because of the competition caused from the substitute for cotton we are fast losing our internal trade on cotton goods, and on account also of the attempted artificial raising of the price of cotton by different pieces of legislation we are in serious danger of losing our export trade in cotton.

The cotton textile manufacturing industry of the Nation is being hurt by the levy of the processing tax, and when the manufacturers are hurt the farmers are likewise hurt; and the cotton farmers of the South will continue to be hurt, both by the domestic use of cotton as well as the loss of export trade. I voted for the Bankhead bill as an emergency measure. I am voting for this legislation today as an emergency measure. But I think, and I am exceedingly serious about it, that those of us from the cotton States, sooner or later, had better get together in order that we can formulate legislation which in the end will not prove detrimental to the cotton farmers of the South.

Whenever the price of cotton gets beyond a certain level, then you will find that cotton will be produced at a small profit in many of the foreign countries in competition with the American cotton.

Mr. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BULWINKLE. Certainly.

Mr. ANDRESEN. It was my understanding that the old law provided that the Secretary of Agriculture could levy a processing tax upon substitutes. Has he done that?

Mr. BULWINKLE. The Secretary of Agriculture has not levied a processing tax on substitutes because, while a great many of us felt and knew that the increased cost of goods caused by the processing tax aided in the substitution of rayon, yet the law provided that unless the shift towards a competing substance, such as rayon, was caused by the levying of the processing tax that it could not be placed upon the substitute. Rayon manufactured into goods is very pretty and has a nice texture. A great many people may use it on account of its looks. The compensating tax would not have anything to do with this, but I feel that the time is coming when, of necessity, not alone for the cotton-textile industry of this Nation but for the farmers themselves, that the processing tax should be removed. The law should be repealed which provides it. If this is done, it will have a tendency to increase the use of cotton in America. The question is, especially with those of us from the South, whether we want to increase the domestic consumption of cotton goods.

Mr. HOLMES. I am in hopes that the cotton manufacturers of Massachusetts will give their cotton the same sheen you are speaking of with respect to rayon.

Mr. BULWINKLE. I agree with the gentleman; only I will go further and hope and trust that the cotton-textile manufacturers of the United States by their efforts will be able in the future to produce cotton goods which in every way will be as pretty as rayon.

In conclusion, let me say to you of the South that the time is now at hand, and not only the southern Members of Congress but the southern Governors and commissioners of agriculture in the various States, when we should formulate plans for the production of cotton in the Southern States, in order that we may retain our domestic market and gain back our foreign trade.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. TARVER: Amend, on page 5, end of section 4, by striking the quotation marks and adding the following: "There shall not be issued to any producer tax-exemption certificates in excess of those necessary to gin tax free the cotton grown by such producer during the year for which tax-exemption certificates are applied; unless such producer, as the Secretary of Agriculture or his authorized agent(s) finds, has suffered a reduction from normal cotton production during the year for which tax-exemption certificates have been applied by reason of drought, storm, flood, insect pests, or other uncontrollable natural cause."

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

Mr. TARVER. One of the most frequent objections to the enforcement of the Bankhead Act comes from farmers who have not received enough certificates of exemption to market their cotton and who have near them neighbors who have received more certificates than they need, and who, after having marketed all of their own crop, proceed to sell their excess of certificates to their less fortunate neighbors.

This amendment simply provides that no man shall have an allotment of cotton-exemption certificates beyond what is necessary to market tax free his own crop.

It seems to me the committee should agree to accept this amendment. There is no reason founded in justice why some favored farmer should be in the receipt of certificates far beyond his needs during a normal season when he produced all the cotton he would have normally produced and his neighbors, because of having been less fortunate in their allotments from the county committee, not be allowed to market all of their cotton without the payment of taxes or the purchase of certificates.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I regret I shall be compelled to insist on the point of order. This particular section applies only to the transfer and assignment of certificates, whereas the amendment refers to the issuance to the producer, which is an entirely different matter, and which is not germane.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Georgia desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, it appears to me that the line of demarcation between what is in order according to the opinion of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JONES] and what is not in order is rather finely drawn, and that it necessarily follows from a reading of the section of the bill to which the amendment I have offered has been proposed, section 4, that anything relating to the issuance of these tax-exempt certificates or to their transfer, or seeking to restrict their transfer, will necessarily be within the purview of the section and in order.

I cannot undertake to discuss the matter at length, because it had not occurred to me that any gentleman would raise a point of order of this character, and I have not studied the parliamentary question involved. It is impossible, however, for me to see how the point of order can be successfully invoked.

The CHAIRMAN. Inasmuch as the section purports to deal with section 9 (d) of the act relating to the transfer of exemption certificates, and inasmuch as the amendment of the gentleman from Georgia does not refer to the subject, in the opinion of the Chair the point of order is well founded.

The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 5. Section 17 of such act, as amended, is amended by inserting "(a)" before the first sentence thereof and by inserting at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) Appropriations for administrative expenses under this act are authorized to be made available to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to pay any person who, in connection with the operation of any cotton gin, incurred additional expense in connection with the administration of this act with respect to cotton harvested and ginned during the crop year 1935–36, and who applies to the Secretary therefor, compensation at the rate of 25 cents per bale of 478 pounds (and fractional parts of a bale in proportion) of such cotton ginned by such person. No payment shall be made under this subsection with respect to cotton ginned after the effective date of any code, license, or marketing agreement entered into or issued under the National Industrial Recovery Act, as amended, or the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended, if under such code, license, or agreement any part of the charges for ginning or other services performed by the ginner includes any expense incurred by the ginner in connection with the administration of this act."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 6, beginning in line 11, strike out "of 478 pounds (and fractional parts of a bale in proportion)."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KLEBERG: Page 6, line 9, after the word "during", insert the words "the crop year 1934–35 and;".

On line 11, after the word "compensation", insert the following: "at the rate of 35 cents per bale for the year 1934–35 and for the year 1935–36."

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I desire to make a point of order against the amendment.

The bill under consideration simply covers 1 year, the crop year of 1935–36, and provides for the payment, or refunding, of some expense to the ginner for this year. This amendment is an attempt to add another year, a different year, and the payment of expense for that additional year. That portion of the amendment which undertakes to increase the rate for this year would be germane, but undertaking to include a previous year, an entirely different transaction, or different year which has already passed, is not germane because this bill covers just 1 year. If there were 2 years, a third could be added, but where there is just 1 year, a second cannot be added.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. KLEBERG. The amendment for the inclusion of last year could very properly follow this part of the bill.

This year's requirement, of course, will be lower and I cannot see why the inclusion of an additional year would not be just as germane as the inclusion of the following year.

The CHAIRMAN. In the opinion of the Chair, this bill deals simply with the crop year 1935–36 and the Chair thinks that an amendment relating to a preceding crop year would not be germane to the pending bill. The Chair therefore sustains the point of order made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 12 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that under this limitation all speeches be limited to 3 minutes, with the exception of that of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BOILEAU].

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BOILEAU: On page 6, line 1, strike out all of section 5.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Chairman, I have no desire to consume the entire 5 minutes, unless perhaps some members of the committee desire to ask questions with reference to this particular section.

I made some remarks earlier in the day in general debate with reference to this particular section, no. 5, which my amendment seeks to take out of the bill. I want to call the attention of the committee to the fact that under the exist-

ing law the ginners of cotton are required to make certain reports to the Treasury and are required to render certain services with reference to the collection of the tax. They now seek by this amendment to have the United States Government pay them for the service they render to the farmers, because after all no one can claim that the service they render in collecting this tax is a service to the Government. The Treasury of the United States certainly does not benefit as the result of the Bankhead Act. We are using the taxing power of the Government to assist the farmers in getting a better price for their cotton and to control production. There is no question but what the service rendered by the ginners in the collection of this tax is a service they render to the farmers and it should be a proper charge to that industry.

Mr. Chairman, under this amendment the United States Treasury would be forced to pay out about two and a half million dollars to the ginners. May I say that in my opinion it would be legalized graft, racketeering. They should be willing to perform this service for the farmer. During all of the hearings before the Committee on Agriculture on all of these bills we have processors coming in and saying, "Why, our interests are tied up with the farmers'. We have a mutuality of interest." We always hear them say that their interests are tied up with those of the farmer, that they are trying to help each other, but during the consideration of this bill is the first time I heard a processor come up and admit that maybe his interest was not quite as mutual with the farmer as other processors had attempted to make us believe. This is a service for the farmer. There is no justification for the United States Treasury paying two and a half million dollars to the ginners for performing this service.

Mr. Chairman, I submit the amendment should be adopted, and the section stricken from the bill.

Mr. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. ANDRESEN. Is it not a fact that in connection with last year's crop they only collected $90,000 in taxes for which they wanted $5,000,000 compensation?

Mr. BOILEAU. There is no question about that, and if their proposition had been in effect last year the Bankhead bill would have brought in $90,000 and we would have paid out $5,000,000 for collection purposes.

Mr. HOPE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOILEAU. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOPE. Assuming there were some revenues collected and the work which was performed was on behalf of the Government of the United States, would there be any difference in the work that these ginners do as compared with the work that many others do who pay Federal taxes, such as keeping their books and records and transmitting their reports to the United States Government?

Mr. BOILEAU. That is true. You might just as well say that a man who pays an income tax to the Government should be paid for making out his tax return.

Mr. KVALE. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. KVALE. Will the next step be to give a payment to the elevator men, to the millers, and to the other processors in the case of other commodities?

Mr. BOILEAU. There is no question about that. If we make this provision applicable to the ginners we will have to go ahead and pay all of those people who collect the processing taxes, the packers, and the rest of them.

Mr. Chairman, I submit the amendment should be adopted.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. TABER. Under the A. A. A., the Treasury Department is reimbursed out of the A. A. A. collections for the operations of collecting?

Mr. BOILEAU. That is part of this money.

Mr. TABER. This goes out of the Treasury?

Mr. BOILEAU. In a sense—it is out of appropriations made for the Agricultural Adjustment Administration. If you give the ginners two and a half million dollars, it means two and a half million dollars less money available to help the farmers.

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

Mr. BOILEAU. I yield.

Mr. DOXEY. Is it not a fact that this is not a direct appropriation coming out of the Treasury, but is a fund set aside for this particular purpose, and when they say only $90,000 was collected, they do not take into consideration the certificates which were sold at 4 cents a pound, and many of which are now outstanding.

Mr. BOILEAU. The gentleman does not want to give the impression that the United States benefits from the sale of these pool tickets?

Mr. DOXEY. The pool tickets go to pay the administrative expenses.

Mr. BOILEAU. Those men who sell their certificates in a pool are paid directly and that does not go into the Treasury. They put their tickets in a pool and they are paid back, so there is no benefit to the Government as a result of the operation of such a pool. The only money this Bankhead Act brought in was $90,000.

Mr. DOXEY. And they have 700,000 bales which they have not sold.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, for the sake of clarity I should like to ask the chairman of the committee whether there is an analogy between the service offered by the packing plants in Chicago and the milling establishments in Minneapolis and that which is rendered by the ginners in the South; and if this is true, then, in all logic and reason, the packers and the millers as processors, would be fully justified in rendering a bill of particulars to the Government of the United States and asking for a similar hand-out, if that is what it is.

Mr. JONES. I think the analogy does not run complete at all, for the reason that the processing fee is a fee due by the packers themselves. The ginning tax involves a good deal more than the processing tax. The ginning tax involves the collection of a tax. It involves separate provisions they must make for the different kind of tags and a reporting system. It is the collection of a tax for the farmer and I think it goes much beyond the processing tax.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yet it is substantially the same kind of service which would justify them in submitting a bill.

Mr. JONES. Except the ginning tax involves a much greater expense because they have so many more details.

Mr. DIRKSEN. What about the processors under the Kerr tobacco bill?

Mr. JONES. Well, we have not had that. The collections under the Bankhead bill will be far more than sufficient to cover any amount that will be paid out in this tax. There are 400,000 of these certificates yet undisposed of.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But it is money that comes out of Uncle Sam's Treasury and is handed over to individuals.

Mr. JONES. No; all administrative expenses are paid out of the collections under the Agricultural Adjustment Administration Act.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But the ultimate consumer has to pay for the benefit that is rendered to an individual.

Mr. JONES. That is a different story altogether.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But it involves the same principle.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. BOILEAU. I should like to ask the chairman of the committee, if the gentleman will permit, whether it is a fact that last year there was only collected $90,000 under the Bankhead Act?

Mr. JONES. Ninety-two thousand up to a certain time, but there are 400,000 certificates yet outstanding, and the gentleman understands that a lot of that cotton was taken back.

Mr. BOILEAU. But the cotton is practically all ginned.

Mr. JONES. But last year was the year of the great drought, and the production was much below the Bankhead allotment.

Mr. BOILEAU. The production was not materially below the allotment.

Mr. JONES. About six or seven hundred thousand bales.

Mr. BOILEAU. That is not a great deal.

Mr. JONES. That is a good deal of cotton.

Mr. BOILEAU. It is not sufficient to bring in enough money to take care of these additional taxes?

Mr. JONES. I think normally we will collect probably several million dollars through these Bankhead taxes.

Mr. BOILEAU. Not if the bill is successful.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment of my distinguished friend from Wisconsin [Mr. BOILEAU] and to call attention to the fact that his argument apparently is based on a theory that does not fit the picture at all. He is talking about the ginners wanting to charge $5,000,000 for having collected $90,000 in taxes. I call his attention to the combination between the plow-up campaign and the operations of the Bankhead Act, where, with the nearly 10,000,000 bales we have now, each bale is worth more than twice as much as they were prior to the plow up and the operation of the Bankhead Act, as a result of the service the ginner did, not only for the farmer, as the gentleman put it, but for this Government.

I call my friend's attention to the fact that the service he speaks of, and bemoans as a paltry service in the collection of $90,000, increases the earning capacity of real property in the entire South.

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

Mr. KLEBERG. This is the foundation of the credit structure. I cannot yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BOILEAU. The gentleman wants to be fair. He has misstated my position.

Mr. KLEBERG. I cannot yield. I asked the gentleman to yield to me and he did not yield.

Mr. BOILEAU. That is true.

Mr. KLEBERG. I also want to call attention to the fact that the real service done for the farmer by the ginners was not the collection of the tax, but was far and above anything the gentleman knows about, and they did this at their own expense. The average ginner in my district paid at least 90 cents per bale for the privilege of serving the farmer.

Does the gentleman believe it is fair for one group of American citizens to be put out of pocket by a law passed by Congress and the administration?

Mr. BOILEAU. I mean to say that the bill would not be self-supporting. The Treasury of the United States is not benefited by the administration of the Bankhead Act.

Mr. KLEBERG. Does the gentleman think that they should be out this money for the service for nothing?

Mr. BOILEAU. No. I say that is a part of the cost of doing business, and they could pass it on to the producer just as they do for labor and machinery.

Mr. KLEBERG. Did the gentleman ever see an agent of the Government work for nothing?

Mr. BOILEAU. Anybody who makes up a tax report is doing something.

Mr. KLEBERG. Did the gentleman ever hear of a tax collector being paid a salary?

Mr. BOILEAU. They do not collect the taxes in the true sense. The United States is not benefited by it.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired, and the question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BOILEAU].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BOILEAU) there were—ayes 37, noes 81.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to page 1 for the purpose of making a correction. In striking out the paragraph the necessary preliminary declaration was stricken out, and I desire to offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 15, strike out all of line 15 and insert:

"Section 2 (a) of the act entitled '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', approved April 21, 1934, is."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the subsequent section numbers be corrected.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk is authorized to correct the section numbers.

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma: On page 6, after line 22, insert the following:

"(c) Appropriations for administrative expenses under this act are authorized to be made available to the Secretary of Agriculture to enable him to mail exemptions certificates to applicants by registered mail."

The CHAIRMAN. All time upon this section has expired.

Mr. JONES. I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes.

Mr. TABER. Do I understand the gentleman from Texas to reserve his point of order?

Mr. JONES. I reserve the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma that he be permitted to proceed for 2 minutes?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to require the Secretary of Agriculture to send the exemption certificates to the farmer by registered mail rather than to force the farmer to go 10 or 15 miles or farther to the county agent's office. Under the present rules the cotton producer must travel to the county seat, call on the county agent, and lose a better part of a day to make an application for his exemption certificate; then go back to the same place and stand in line for 3 hours or 3 days, as the case may be, to get his exemption certificate.

It is said that it will cost some money to send these exemption certificates by registered mail. The cost will only be 10 or 12 cents. Surely this great Government of ours can afford to spend 10 or 12 cents rather than the cotton farmer can afford to spend a day and probably a dollar or a dollar and half or $2 to go to town to get his exemption certificate. This is one of the weaknesses of the Bankhead Act. It is absurd to require the farmer to go to town to the county agent's office and stand in line to get his exemption certificate. I hope the Chairman will not press his point of order against this amendment, but will permit the Committee to vote on its merits. Since the Department has thus far refused to do anything to correct this obnoxious practice Congress ought to do so.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, this is an administrative matter. I make the point of order that it is not germane.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair rules that the amendment is not germane in view of the fact that it provides for the mailing of the exemption certificate, which has nothing to do with the bill under consideration. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. LANHAM, Chairman of the Committee of the whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 6424, and had directed him to report the same back with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the

amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded upon any amendment? If not the Chair will put them en grosse.

The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following motion to recommit which I send to the desk.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill.

Mr. BOILEAU. I am.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BOILEAU moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Agriculture, with instructions that the committee report the bill back forthwith with the following amendment:

Page 6, line 1, strike out all of section 5.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and on a division, demanded by Mr. BOILEAU, there were—ayes 41, noes 106.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that there is no quorum present and make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to extend their own remarks on this bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

HOW THE FEDERAL LAND BANK AT ST. PAUL OPERATES WITH FARMERS OF THE NORTHWEST AND HOW THE PRESENT SYSTEM CANNOT RELIEVE THE FARMERS

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker:

FEDERAL LAND BANK, ST. PAUL, ESTABLISHED IN 1920

PRESENT OFFICERS

Roy A. Nelson, president. Republican. South Dakota banker formerly connected with Northwest National Bank of Minneapolis, member Northwest Bank Corporation, former receiver Southern Minneapolis Joint Stock Land Bank.

Frank G. Wanek, vice president and secretary. Republican; Hoover appointee. Secretary from 1928 to 1933. Now vice president. Chain banker.

G. S. Gordhamer, vice president and treasurer. Banker; Republican. Chain banker.

F. H. Klawon, was director and president from 1928 to 1934, but on the demands of thousands of complaints coming from North Dakota, Klawon was removed as president, and Roy A. Nelson took his place. Klawon was a banker connected with the Minneapolis and St. Paul chain-bank ring. A Republican.

Being requested to resign, we lost sight of Klawon for about 24 hours. When the smoke of complaint cleared, we find him complacently sitting behind the desk of the president of the intermediate credit bank, just across the street, where he still remains, entrenched through the power of the Twin City chain-bank ring.

There were, of course, other directors, but they were scattered around the country. All bankers and all Republicans, but who were not actively engaged in the business.

The complaints against the bank still come in and the main complaint is that, no matter what the interest rate is, even if it were as low as the rate in the Frazier-Lemke bill, still the Federal land bank would not serve the farmers generally. It is manned by too many bankers, and by those whose reactionary tendencies renders them quite incapable of rendering a service that is imperative and necessary.

I have not made an investigation of the countless army of field men, attorneys, and appraisers, but this I do know that a great many of these men are "busted bankers" of the Northwest.

In the period from May 1, 1933, to December 31, 1934, the number of farm-loan applications from North Dakota alone to this bank was 41,759. Of this number only 13,377 land-bank loans were made, or 32 percent.

Seventeen thousand two hundred and sixty loans were converted into commissioners' loans, which required chattel security and crop security. Eleven thousand one hundred and twenty-two farmers from North Dakota were turned away, not receiving any help from either the bank or the commissioner.

In addition to this it must be remembered that of the loans actually made, all on an average were reduced 26 percent. In other words, of the original land-loan applications made by farmers only 74 percent of them were not reduced, and of this 74 percent considered only 32 percent were made by the bank. This leaves the percentage of loans made on the original applications only 26.88 percent.

In all, only $73,567,000 was loaned in North Dakota by both the Federal land bank and the commissioners. The farm indebtedness on land in North Dakota is three hundred million, nearly, if not all, of which is due. There is still needed two hundred and twenty-seven million to take up the debt. It cannot be had, and that is the reason why we have had to resort to Holiday Association activity and secure State-wide moratoriums against foreclosures.

The financing of farms under the present Federal land-bank plan means in North Dakota, if all loans were made by the bank, an annual interest charge of $18,000,000. Under the Frazier-Lemke plan the annual interest charge would be on $4,500,000 and principal payments of $4,500,000, or a saving of $9,000,000 per year, and with the further security that as the annual payments were made, the whole debt would be wiped out at the end of the loan period. In 47 years—the loan period under the Frazier-Lemke bill—the farmers would make a saving of $423,000,000, and besides, the debt would be fully paid at the end of the period. Under the Federal land-bank plan in 47 years the farmers in North Dakota would have paid in interest alone $846,000,000, and they would still owe the debt of $300,000,000 besides.

The net difference would be, for North Dakota alone, $723,000,000, or nearly two and one-half times the amount of the present indebtedness.

Could the farmers of North Dakota buy anything with this seven hundred and twenty-three million? Would they become customers again in the trade channels? Would they buy manufactured products from the East and South? Would men who have no work find work?

Let each Congressman apply these figures to his own State and thus determine what can be done by a change in our system of farm loans.

In the meantime, how would the Government fare? The Treasury bills issued to finance the Frazier-Lemke plan would not draw interest. The Government would be out just the cost of printing. Today the Federal Reserve notes are issued in the same manner. Nearly $4,000,000,000 of them in circulation. When the Government wants money, bonds are issued, and then sold to the financial system at 3½-percent interest. Sometimes more. The Government loses this interest and private interests gain that amount. If the Government issued currency to finance the farm indebtedness of $9,000,000,000, they would save under this system $315,000,000 annually. In 47 years the Government would save $14,705,000,000, or enough to pay one-half of the World War debt.

The Government would be the winner, the farm homes would be saved and the unequal distribution of wealth in the Nation would be on the way to adjustment. This unequal distribution of wealth never would have taken place

if we had, as voters, determined that this Government should control its finances and not turn that important function over to private interests.

The complaint lodged against many of the men who have been connected with these Government institutions and referred to as Republicans is not to say that no Republican should be connected with the institutions, but when I have used the word Republican, I mean reactionary Republican. By reactionary I mean one who is satisfied with and connected with a business system that can see nothing but profits and business gain; one who believes that all new measures intended to bring back to the people a greater share of the Government, is visionary, disquieting to business—their profit business—and that the sponsors of these new measures are demagogues and reds. Any one who intimates the curtailment of private profits is looked upon as an enemy of the country. These reactionaries have been in possession of the machinery of Government so long that they are actually beginning to believe they own the Government.

It is men of this type that have been intrusted with the responsibility of handling these Government agencies concerned with advancing credits to the people of the Northwest. If the Democratic Party is the party of progress, the party which hopes to restore the Government to the people, it can make no faster headway than to remove every reactionary in control of these finance institutions. The Democrats could not do a worse job, and besides, there are some progressive Democrats who are capable of handling important business. Why does not the Democratic administration clean house in the Twin Cities? Can it be that these wily, reactionary Coolidge-Hoover Republican appointees have been wise enough to make liberal contributions to the Democratic Party? I do not know that they have, but I do know they would if they thought that meant leaving them in the Government cream pan. It may be due to the fact that between these men in control in the Twin Cities and the higher-ups here at Washington there is a community of interest arising from the profession (financial brotherhood), that is stronger than any political party. Whatever the reason they are still doing business at the old stand.

Do these reactionaries turn down applications of farmers because they are what they are pleased to call "radical"? The answer is absolutely "yes." I have had filed with me during the past year complaint after complaint where the failure of a loan was due to the fact of the applicant's political belief. The whole finance administration in the Northwest is out of sympathy with the people. The directors, officers, appraisers, and every last employee is known to be "conservative." They make conservative loans. I have never yet met any director, officer, appraiser, attorney, or other employee of this whole Federal land bank set-up, outside of the Federal Land Bank Commissioner, who can stomach the word "progressive", yet the great majority of the people with which this organization deals is overwhelmingly progressive. The farmers know their friends and sympathizers are not in control.

I have many complaints here which show that the farmer was turned down because he was a nonpartisan. I have complaints here that Communists because they were Communists have been turned down. I have complaints here that because farmers were radical and did not mind their own business, caused a rejection of their applications.

Reactionary treatment of that kind only makes the matter worse. I think it perfectly fair to make this statement, that the reactionaries in America are doing more to build up the ranks of the Soviet than all the Communist organizers in America. The American farmer is not naturally a Communist; he is an individual and believes in individual property and individual expression, but I want to also add that the reactionaries are doing the best they know how to drive him into communism. A half-starved man with underfed children, with starving livestock in the sight of Government feed, knowing that the administrators of relief are against him, a man who has been turned down in his loan and sees the sheriff coming for a foreclosure sale, will embrace any belief which promises any measure of protection. Reactionary business men do not know this principle of human nature. They have never known it. In the history of the world, men of this type have always refused to see the evidence before them, and the future of the country which protects them concerns them not. Their patriotism is one of more profits, more gain, more money, and let the common people be damned.

PUBLIC OPINION AND THE FRAZIER-LEMKE BILL. H. R. 2066—S. 212

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McFARLANE. Mr. Speaker, there is now pending on your desk House Resolution 123 by Mr. WILLIAM LEMKE, of North Dakota, which provides for the discharge of the Committee on Agriculture from further consideration of H. R. 2066 commonly known as the "Frazier-Lemke bill", the farmers' farm-relief act. This is a bill to liquidate and refinance agricultural indebtedness at a reduced rate of interest by establishing an efficient credit system, through the use of the Farm Credit Administration, the Federal Reserve banking system, and creating a board of agriculture to supervise the same.

This measure and similar measures have been widely discussed for the past several years throughout the Nation. There are now on file before this Congress concurrent resolutions enacted by the house and senate of 29 State legislatures memorializing Congress to speedily enact this legislation into law, as follows: Montana, Nevada, Wisconsin, Illinois, Minnesota, North Dakota, California, Nebraska, Oregon, Indiana, Arizona, Idaho, Colorado, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Tennessee, Iowa, South Carolina, Kansas, Michigan, Ohio, Texas, Kentucky, Wyoming, North Carolina, Arkansas, New Mexico, New Jersey, and Washington.

The lower houses of the following State legislatures have memorialized Congress to enact this law: New York, Delaware, Alabama, and Missouri.

In addition, the following Governors have sent telegrams, within the last 10 days, urging their representatives in Congress and the Committee on Agriculture to have the bill reported out for discussion and passage on the floor: Governor La Follette, Wisconsin; Governor Floyd Olson, Minnesota; Governor Berry, South Dakota; and the Governor and Legislature of Michigan sent a special delegation to Washington last week to urge their representatives to sign the petition to bring the Frazier-Lemke bill out on the floor for discussion on its merits and passage.

Mr. J. Edward Anderson, State secretary, Minnesota Farmers Union, has received the following telegram from Governor Olson, of St. Paul, Minn., showing his attitude and the attitude and the sentiment in Minnesota regarding this legislation:

ST. PAUL, MINN., *March 14, 1935.*

J. EDWARD ANDERSON,
State Secretary Minnesota Farmers' Union, Harrington Hotel.

The people of Minnesota are solidly behind the Frazier-Lemke bill. Nineteen thirty-three legislature passed concurrent resolution memorializing the President and Congress to enact bill. This bill represents the only legislation now proposed before Congress which will assist Minnesota farmers in retaining their homes.

FLOYD B. OLSON, *Governor.*

Mr. Speaker, it was mentioned today by one of our colleagues "Some of them (memorials) are about as foolish as I have ever seen written on paper. If we are going to continue to put them into the body of the RECORD, we will not have any place for the proceedings of the House."

It seems that the above-quoted memorials by a large majority of the States throughout the Nation urging Congress to enact this legislation is beginning to worry some of the Members of Congress. At this time 124 Members of the House have signed the above resolution to discharge the Agriculture Committee from further consideration of the bill and to bring this legislation before Congress for a vote.

An effort was made in the last session of Congress to force a vote upon this question and through a maneuver in par-

liamentary procedure such a vote was avoided by the leaders of the House. The farmers of the Nation are demanding this legislation and the sooner this legislation is brought before the House the better pleased the farmers and their friends will feel about this legislation.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS—COTTON CONTROL

Mr. WHELCHEL. Mr. Speaker, I am intensely interested in the subject that we now have under discussion; that is, a bill introduced by Mr. DOXEY, a member of the Agriculture Committee, to amend the Bankhead law.

On Januuary 28, 1935, I introduced a bill, it being H. R. 4882. I did not feel that the small farmers were getting a square deal, by reason of the operation of the Bankhead bill, and, as a result of this, I was actuated to introduce the bill that I have just mentioned. The provisions of my measure were to the effect that a small farmer be exempted 2 bales of cotton, and in addition thereto, one-half bale for each dependent of his family, exclusive of himself and wife, and also to pay a reasonable compensation for the ginners, who had been occasioned so much work and worry, by reason of collecting the imposed taxes.

Now, as I understand, this bill, it being H. R. 6424, provides for an exemption of 3 bales to each farmer and 25 cents per bale for the ginners, and also an appeal board is provided in this bill, H. R. 6424.

If I understand correctly, it is the purpose of this measure to exempt 3 bales to each farmer. My information is that the Department of Agriculture insists that an exemption of 2 bales shall be given to only land-owning farmers, which would exclude tenants and croppers.

These provisions of the Department, making the allowance thus, would work a hardship more than ever on the small farmers. Since H. R. 6424, as I understand proposes to make the exemption to every farmer, this to include land-owning, cropper, or tenant farmer, and rather than take a chance of getting the whole measure defeated, and it be in force, as of last year, I am not insisting that my bill be made a substitute for the one now under consideration.

While this measure does not do justice to the small farmers, in my opinion, it is much better than the previous provision, and will make the burden of the small farmer, to some extent, lighter.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to support this legislation, as amended, in the hope that it will render a greater measure of justice and benefit to the small cotton farmers of the South and the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, we can have no permanent business prosperity unless it is based on agriculture, and it is essential that our cotton, tobacco, grain, and dairy farmers be recognized and treated in all our legislation on a parity with industry.

I desire to quote a brief statement from Louis J. Taber, master of the National Grange, contained in his address delivered before the National Grange annual session at Hartford, Conn., on November 14, 1934:

In May of 1933 the industrial price level stood at 101 and the agricultural prices at 62 of pre-war, giving a spread of 39 points to the disadvantage of agriculture. There has been definite improvement during recent months, and the October price index of the Department of Agriculture shows that farm prices have risen to 102 of pre-war (1909–14), while industrial prices have climbed rapidly and stand at 126. Thus, farm-purchasing power is still retarded and the farm dollar stands at but 81 cents. Restored farm-purchasing power still remains an essential step to national recovery as well as to rural welfare. Every constructive step that the administration, Congress, organized agriculture, and farmers themselves can take should be directed toward bringing the farm dollar to par, not only for the good of agriculture but of the Nation itself. It is true that in some sections we find certain commodities that have now reached their pre-war level. Other commodities, like dairying and some types of vegetable growing and general farming, are in less satisfactory condition than a few years ago. On the whole, the agricultural picture is encouraging. Farm conditions have improved during the last year. The farmer can look toward 1935 with more assurance than in any year in a decade. While the fight for equality and price parity is far from won, agriculture's leadership must not be modest in demanding their own rights, because we cannot benefit the farmer without benefiting those in every walk of life.

THE EMERGENCY PROGRAM

This Congress and administration received a mandate from the people to seek a solution of the farm problems, and the heroic and unusual steps taken were made necessary by the seriousness of the farm situation. The Agricultural Adjustment Act was the method selected to fulfill the pledges to the public. While emergency and experimental in its character, automatically passing out whenever the President declares the emergency is passed, service has been rendered to many commodities in distress. Acreage restriction has been of value to many crops, and benefit payments have had a tendency to restore farm purchasing power. As a result of the drought, acreage restrictions are not now so seriously needed, but guidance and balance will be essential to ease agriculture through their period of readjustment. With practically all of our burdensome surpluses under control, with an actual shortage in seed and forage, little reduction is required for 1935, and we can hope for gradual elimination of restrictive measures.

OUR LONG-TERM PROGRAM

President Roosevelt and his administration, the Department of Agriculture, and the A. A. A., are to be commended for the thoughtful efforts being made to develop a long-time agricultural program that can meet the changing conditions confronting our farm life.

Mr. Speaker, we have made substantial progress in our efforts to rehabilitate agriculture, as evidenced by increased prices of all farm products, but our goal will not have been attained until the farmer receives a reasonable profit above the cost of production.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I am very much interested in this bill, which was introduced by my colleague the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi, WALL DOXEY. It will be recalled by members of the Agricultural Committee and other interested parties that early in the session I introduced a similar bill. The only substantial difference between my bill and the one now under consideration is that the bill of my distinguished colleague [Mr. DOXEY] provides for a 2-bale exemption to the small cotton farmers of the South and mine provided for a 5-bale exemption. Inasmuch as Mr. DOXEY is the ranking member of the Agriculture Committee, it was only appropriate that the committee should have reported out his bill. Moreover, Mr. DOXEY has given much thought to this problem and is certainly one of the ablest members of that distinguished committee.

However, my colleague from Arkansas, who is also very much concerned about this matter, has offered his amendment to Mr. DOXEY's bill, which would increase the exemption from the processing tax from 2 bales to 3 bales. At the time Mr. MILLER obtained recognition from the Chair to offer his amendment I was on my feet seeking recognition so that I might offer my amendment to increase it to 5 bales. Nevertheless, I shall support my colleague's amendment to Mr. DOXEY's bill, with the hope that it would have a better opportunity of passing and thereby secure a 3-bale exemption from this tax rather than to run the risk of muddying the waters by my amendment and possibly not getting more than a 2-bale exemption.

But, Mr. Speaker, we are told that the Agricultural Adjustment Administration officials do not look with favor upon any exemption measure. It is said that they claim that we will disrupt the whole Bankhead control program if we grant these exemptions to the small farmer. Frankly, I would vote for this exemption to our small farmers from this tax if I knew that it would disrupt the whole control program. But I do not believe that it will have any such effect. The truth is that while it appeared last year that something had to be done in order to save the cotton farmer of the South and that the Bankhead Cotton Control Act was enacted into law for that purpose, and while it is true that we were in a great economic disturbance and a national emergency, yet I doubt seriously that any such program as this is economically sound. And I would not be a party to it as a permanent institution. Moreover, I doubt seriously that if I had an opportunity now to vote on the question of continuing the act for another year that I would vote for it. At the best it is a makeshift proposition. We must realize sooner or later that the law of supply and demand is as immutable as the stars in the heavens. In this time of great economic depression, I am wondering if we have not been doing many things that were an attempt to hold in abeyance, if not repeal, this law. The only justification that can be made of that type of legislation is that it was justified by the great national emergency.

If the Members of the House could have witnessed first hand what I witnessed down in the cotton-growing section of the South, there would be no doubt about the passage of this amendment to the control act. They would have seen, not in one isolated instance, but in thousands of instances, some poor farmer coming to the gin with his 2 or 3 bales of cotton to be ginned. These 2 or 3 bales of cotton represented his entire wealth for that year. Upon his ability to sell it depended his ability to pay the supply merchant for the supplies advanced and his ability to feed, clothe, and educate his children for the coming winter. Then only to be confronted at the gin with the proposition that under the allotment of that particular county that they were entitled to only gin possibly 200 pounds, or maybe a bale, without paying the exorbitant processing tax upon the balance. If this tax were paid, of course the farmer would not break even. Yet many of them in their desperation paid the tax and their families suffered the consequences.

It is very obvious that the danger of losing our foreign market is great if any control of our domestic production is continued. Other parts of the world have learned that they too can grow cotton. Not only can they grow cotton, but in many instances they can grow it cheaper than we can here. It is obvious to one who stops to think that if we continue to curb our production in this country those countries of the world who can grow cotton will speed up their production in order to take advantage of the increased price and the scarcity of cotton on the market. I am very apprehensive that if this control policy continues we will lose the world market. In furtherance of this thought it is a significant fact that while we were reducing our production of cotton under the Bankhead Act last year, there was a sharp increase in the production in other countries. For instance, India increased her production 8 percent, Egypt increased her production 22 percent, and Brazil increased her production 68 percent.

It is therefore quite evident that this question of the world market is in no sense a light matter. It requires and demands our most thoughtful consideration. I cannot see how we can continue this control policy and at the same time keep our world market.

What I should like to see done would be to peg the prices of the cotton to be consumed in this country at a definite figure, say, 12 cents. Then say to the farmers of the country that they can raise all the additional cotton over the domestic market that they see fit and take a chance on the world market for what they may get for it. Mr. Speaker, I have under consideration just such legislation, which I hope to discuss at a future date.

And in conclusion may I say to my colleagues who reside north of the Mason and Dixon's line that this cotton problem is primarily our problem in the South just as other questions are peculiarly our questions in the South. The great majority of the southern Representatives in this House are in favor of this exemption, and I appeal to you to go along with us in this and let us have this exemption and thereby help the poor southern farmer to this extent at least.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my conclusions with reference to H. R. 6424, which is a bill introduced by Mr. DOXEY, of Mississippi, and which provides for certain amendments to the Bankhead bill. I represent 25 agricultural counties, most of which are devoted to cotton production.

Now, a section of the Doxey bill, as amended, provides that cotton farmers who have a tax-exempt allotment of 3 bales or less shall be permitted to sell tax free 3 bales of cotton. This section does not mean that all cotton farmers shall have the right to sell 3 bales tax free. It only applies to the 3-bale farmers. I am informed that in certain portions of Arkansas and in portions of other southern States the great majority of the cotton farmers in particular sections are so-called "3-bale farmers", or produce less than 3 bales. If this provision becomes a law, the number of 3-bale farmers will, in my opinion, greatly increase. The allotment of these States will be greatly increased. This will result in decreasing the allotment for Texas and especially west Texas. The average farmer in the Nineteenth Congressional District is not a so-called "big planter", but he is by no means a 3-bale farmer. The farmer having an allotment of 5, 10, 20, or 30 bales will reap no benefit from this section of the Doxey bill, but, on the other hand, will be penalized and discriminated against. I think this provision is unwarranted and unwise and is destined to wreck the reduction program. There are many vicious evils in the Bankhead bill that ought to be remedied, but in this 3-bale exemption provision we are curing none of the evils and are discriminating against the biggest cotton-producing State in the Union.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. FITZPATRICK, for 2 days, on account of important business.

To Mr. LAMNECK, indefinitely, on account of illness.

To Mr. TONRY, for today, on account of illness.

To Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania, indefinitely, on account of illness.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1386. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim, or claims, of Duke E. Stubbs and Elizabeth S. Stubbs, both of McKinley Park, Alaska; to the Committee on Claims.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. PARSONS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 5255. An act making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice and for the judiciary, and for the Departments of Commerce and Labor, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. PARSONS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on the following dates present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

On March 16, 1935:

H. R. 5221. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act with respect to rice, and for other purposes.

On March 18, 1935:

H. R. 5255. An act making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice and for the judiciary, and for the Departments of Commerce and Labor, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 47 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 19, 1935, at 12 o'clock noon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. JONES: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 6772. A bill to amend the Grain Futures Act to prevent and remove obstructions and burdens upon interstate commerce in grains and other commodities by regulating transactions therein on commodity futures exchanges, to limit or abolish short selling, to curb manipulation, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 421). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. R. 6453. A bill to amend the act of May 13, 1924, entitled "An act providing for a study regarding the equitable use of the waters of the Rio Grande", and so forth, as amended by the public resolution of March 3, 1927; without amend-

ment (Rept. No. 422). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. COLDEN: Committee on Disposition of Useless Executive Papers in the United States Civil Service Department. (Rept. No. 423). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MANSFIELD: Committee on Rivers and Harbors. H. R. 6732. A bill authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 424). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WOOD: Committee on War Claims. H. R. 2024. A bill for the relief of officers and soldiers of the volunteer service of the United States mustered into service for the War with Spain and who were held in service in the Philippine Islands after the ratification of the treaty of peace, April 11, 1899; with amendment (Rept. No. 425). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CONNERY: Committee on Labor. S. 147. An act to alter the amount apportioned to certain States for public employment offices affiliated with the United States Employment Service; without amendment (Rept. No. 426). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CONNERY: Committee on Labor. S. 857. An act to authorize the Department of Labor to continue to make special statistical studies upon payment of the cost thereof, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 428). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. BEITER: Committee on War Claims. S. 941. An act for the relief of William J. Cocke; without amendment (Rept. No. 427). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 2398) granting a pension to Mary Wyse Benson; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 4222) granting an increase of pension to Margaret A. Skeel; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. McSWAIN: A bill (H. R. 6793) to amend the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma (by departmental request): A bill (H. R. 6794) to provide for the payment of certain Creek equalization claims, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. KERR: A bill (H. R. 6795) to authorize the deportation of the habitual criminal, to guard against the separation from their families of aliens of the noncriminal classes, to provide for legalizing the residence in the United States of certain classes of aliens, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. COCHRAN: A bill (H. R. 6796) to provide for the payment of veterans' adjusted-service certificates in bonds of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GIFFORD: A bill (H. R. 6797) to establish protective tariff on all importations of scallops; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HENNINGS: A bill (H. R. 6798) to assure to persons within the jurisdiction of every State the equal protection of the laws by discouraging, preventing, and punishing the crime of lynching; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON: A bill (H. R. 6799) to amend section 1 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KOCIALKOWSKI: A bill (H. R. 6800) authorizing the construction of buildings for the United States High Commissioner to the government of the Commonwealth of the Philippine Islands; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Utah: A bill (H. R. 6801) to provide for the construction of a post-office building in Provo, Utah; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SEARS: A bill (H. R. 6802) to provide for the manufacture of citrus-fruit brandy and the use of such brandy in the fortification of citrus wines, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILSON of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 6803) to authorize funds for the prosecution of works for flood control and protection against flood disasters; to the Committee on Flood control.

By Mr. ANDREWS of New York; A bill (H. R. 6804) to provide for the payment of veterans' adjusted-service certificates in bonds of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARTLEY: A bill (H. R. 6805) to provide for the appointment and promotion of substitute postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. KENNEY: A bill (H. R. 6806) to provide for a loan committee in the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to pass on industrial loans; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6807) to authorize the Commissioner of Education in the Department of the Interior to conduct a study and disseminate his findings and recommendations regarding suitable aviation-instruction courses for the public schools, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. KRAMER: A bill (H. R. 6808) to apply the quota system to immigration from the Republic of Mexico and the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. LEE of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 6809) to give the cotton farmer Government benefits on domestically consumed cotton without limiting production, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McSWAIN: A bill (H. R. 6810) to provide for the national defense by promoting the development and improvement of military aircraft, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 6811) to enforce the twenty-first amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONNERY: Resolution (H. Res. 166) providing for the consideration of H. R. 2827, a bill to provide for the establishment of unemployment, old-age, and social insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mrs. GREENWAY: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 218) to authorize funds for work and work relief, to be used for the construction of homes for aged (public) pensioners; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CROSSER of Ohio: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 219) extending the effective period of the Emergency Railroad Transportation Act, 1933; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SIROVICH: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 220) providing for the establishment of an executive department to be known as the "Department of Science, Art, and Literature"; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. IGLESIAS: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 221) to amend a joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution for the relief of Porto Rico", approved December 21, 1928, as amended by the Second Deficiency Act, fiscal year 1929, approved March 4, 1929; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KELLER: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 222) to provide for the appointment of Gutzon Borglum as a member of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; to the Committee on the Library.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska, re the distribution of grain for seed purposes to needy farmers; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska, re an antilynching law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Tennessee, re the taxation of sales in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Tennessee, re the construction of certain dams by the Tennessee Valley Authority; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AMLIE: A bill (H. R. 6812) for the relief of John Reinke; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 6813) for the relief of Jennie Williams; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BLAND: A bill (H. R. 6814) for the relief of the Eastern Shore of Virginia Produce Exchange, Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. COLE of New York: A bill (H. R. 6815) to extend the benefits of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act approved September 7, 1916, as amended, to LaVantia H. Simmons; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CONNERY: A bill (H. R. 6816) for the relief of Andrew J. Wendling; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOFFMAN: A bill (H. R. 6817) to correct the military record of Charles B. Holmes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 6818) conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, examine, adjudicate, and enter judgment in any claims which the Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Tribes of Indians may have against the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. LEA of California: A bill (H. R. 6819) granting a pension to Thomas J. Davis; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 6820) granting a pension to Lucy Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SANDERS of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 6821) for the relief of Alfred J. White and M. J. Banker; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SAUTHOFF: A bill (H. R. 6822) for the relief of George C. Mansfield Co., and George D. Mansfield; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SCOTT: A bill (H. R. 6823) granting a pension to Laura B. Perley; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHORT: A bill (H. R. 6824) granting an increase of pension to Christina M. Sharp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 6825) for the relief of Mrs. Clarence J. McClary; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WHELCHEL: A bill (H. R. 6826) to correct the military record of Jonathan Waters; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6827) granting an increase of pension to Eugene B. Dougherty; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6828) granting 6 months' pay to George H. Smith; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WOLCOTT: A bill (H. R. 6829) authorizing a preliminary examination of Sebewaing River, in Huron County, Mich., with a view to the controlling of floods; to the Committee on Flood Control.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

4151. By Mr. AMLIE. Petition of the City Council of Kenosha, Wis., urging the adoption of the resolution providing that a General Pulaski Memorial Day be created; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4152. Also, petition of the City Council of Kenosha, Wis., urging the adoption of the Patman bill, providing for an immediate cash payment of the bonus; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4153. Also, petition of the City Council of Kenosha, Wis., urging that Congress request that Order No. 23709, of the Federal Emergency Administration of Public Works, be vacated, inasmuch as this order, if permitted to stand, will, it is alleged, result in crippling or destroying organized labor; to the Committee on Labor.

4154. By Mr. BLAND: Petition of 23 citizens of Accomac County, requesting that Congress pass a uniform Federal old-age pension law that must be adopted by the States before any Federal aid or relief is available; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4155. By Mr. BOYLAN: Petition signed by Henry Lahm and other residents of the Fifteenth Congressional District of New York, opposing the passage of the Wheeler-Rayburn public-utility bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

4156. Also, petition signed by Salvatore Citrano, of New York City, favoring the passage of the Vinson bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4157. By Mr. BUCKLER of Minnesota: Petition of C. M. Ellingson, commander, and members of the American Legion, Department of Minnesota, of Nielsville and vicinity in Minnesota, asking for passage of the Vinson bill (H. R. 3896) to make the immediate cash payment of the soldiers' adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4158. Also, petition of Mrs. Louis Rodal, unit secretary, in behalf of the members of the Nielsville (Minn.) Ladies Auxiliary Unit of American Legion Post, No. 336, Department of Minnesota, praying for the passage of the Vinson bill (H. R. 3896) to make the immediate cash payment of the soldiers' adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4159. Also, petition of Clarence A. Oefstedal, commander, and Paul Taallerud, adjutant, of Fertile, Minn., of the Post No. 238 of the American Legion, in behalf of members of the post, praying for the passage of legislation to make the immediate cash payment of the soldiers' adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4160. By Mr. BURDICK: Petition urging the Agricultural Adjustment Administration to work out a cattle program to provide for adjustment benefits to the end that parity prices may be obtained for cattle, and producers of cattle enabled to reestablish their almost depleted estates; to the Committee on Agriculture.

4161. By Mr. BURNHAM: Petition of National Indian War Veterans, United States Army, by Joseph H. McKenna, San Diego, Calif., asking for the passage of the bill (H. R. 2857) to amend an act entitled "An act granting pensions to certain soldiers who served in the Indian wars from 1817 to 1898, and for other purposes", approved March 3, 1927"; to the Committee on Pensions.

4162. Also, resolution by the Townsend Old-Age Revolving-Pension Club, No. 33, of San Diego, Calif., urging Congress to immediately enact into law a bill (H. R. 3977) known as the "Townsend revolving-pension plan", to promote the general welfare, to assure permanent employment, and social security for all, and to stabilize business conditions through an assured definite and constant circulation of money and credit by the National Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4163. Also, resolution no. 1314, by the City Council of the City of Coronado, Calif., urging Congress to immediately enact into law a bill (H. R. 3977) known as the "Townsend revolving-pension plan", to promote the general welfare, to assure permanent employment and social security for all,

and to stabilize business conditions through an assured definite and constant circulation of money and credit by the National Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4164. By Mr. CARTER: Petition of the Board of Supervisors of the County of Alameda, State of California, urging Congress to remove all unwarranted obstacles to wine distribution; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4165. By Mr. CROWE: Petition of the Aurora Fish and Game Club of Aurora, Ind., by J. H. Trester, president, signed by 175 members and citizens of Aurora, urging the passage of the Crowe bill (H. J. 157), joint resolution to authorize a compact or agreement between Kentucky and Indiana with respect to hunting and fishing privileges, and other matters relating to jurisdiction on the Ohio River, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4166. By Mr. CROWTHER: Petition of Group No. 878, of the Polish National Alliance of the United States, favoring enactment of House Joint Resolution 81; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4167. By Mr. CULLEN: Petition of the Legislature of the State of New York, urging Secretary of the Interior Ickes to appropriate funds for slum clearance and better housing in certain sections of the area contained within the third and fifth assembly districts, within the Thirteenth Senate District in the Borough of Manhattan, extending from Tenth Street to Sixty-third Street, west of Seventh and Eighth Avenues, and sections being commonly known as "Greenwich Village" and "Chelsea" on the west of Manhattan Borough; to the Committee on Appropriations.

4168. By Mr. DELANEY: Petition of the Senate of the State of New York, urging that the Secretary of the Interior appropriate funds for slum clearance and better housing in the Third and Fifth Assembly District in the Borough of Manhattan, N. Y.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

4169. By Mr. EKWALL: Petition of Group No. 549, of the Polish National Alliance of the United States of North America, memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact House Joint Resolution 81 and Senate Joint Resolution 11, directing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4170. By Mr. FOCHT: Resolution of J. R. Gearhart, of the Pennsylvania Dairymen's Association, urging import duty on registered dairy cattle from other countries; to the Committee on Agriculture.

4171. Also, resolution of the Mount Union Council of Junior Order United Americans, in regard to report submitted by special committee to the Secretary of Labor in reference to immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

4172. Also, resolution of the Mount Union Council of Junior Order United Americans, in regard to millions illegally residing in this country; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

4173. By Mr. GINGERY: Petition of James J. Patterson, Post No. 813, Veterans of Foreign Wars, civic organizations, and citizens of Du Bois, Pa., requesting support of House bill 1, commonly known as the "Patman bill"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4174. By Mr. HOEPPEL: Petition of the City Council of the City of Montebello, Calif., expressing support of the Townsend plan of old-age pensions and urging its enactment into law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4175. Also, petition of business and professional men and women of Azusa, Calif., requesting that the McGroarty bill, embodying the Townsend old-age revolving-pension plan, be reported out of committee to the floor of the House for full and unhampered debate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4176. By Mr. HOFFMAN: Petitions presented by Earl Irwin, John Colbe, Thomas Darling, Merrill F. Fitch, John J. Miller, F. P. Hutchins, and Ray Welker, containing signatures of 242 persons, all residents of the Fourth Congressional District of Michigan, favoring enactment of the Frazier-Lemke bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

4177. By Mr. HOOK: Resolution adopted by the Common Council of the City of Norway, Mich., as favoring legislation to proclaim October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4178. Also, resolution passed by the Common Council of the Village of Laurium, as going on record as favoring a strong national policy by the Government of the United States, and recommending and urging the enactment of such legislation as may be necessary and proper to effectively prohibit the importation of any foreign produced, raw or refined copper; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4179. Also, petition of Edward Ollila of Ironwood, Mich., and several other railway postal clerks and substitute railway postal clerks, asking assistance in protecting their rights as Wisconsin clerks to jobs rightfully theirs on trains running in and through Wisconsin, to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

4180. Also, resolution passed by the Common Council of the City of Detroit, asking for an appropriation to construct a Veterans' Administration hospital in the Detroit area; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

4181. Also, resolution adopted by the Houghton County, Mich., association of commerce as being opposed to legislation being enacted to make potatoes a basic commodity under the Agricultural Adjustment Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

4182. By Mr. KEE: Petition of citizens of the city of Bluefield, W. Va., urging the passage of House bill 5262; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

4183. By Mr. KENNEY: Resolution of the Institute of Rural Economics of State of New Jersey, urging our President to use every effort to execute tariff and trade agreements which will maintain and increase foreign outlets for apples; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4184. Also, petition of Sun-Ray Democratic Association, No. 1, of New York City, endorsing the national lottery bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4185. Also, petition of Loggia Giuseppe Scarlata, No. 73, Ordine Indipendente Figli D'Italia, of Corona, Long Island, New York City, heartily endorsing the national lottery bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4186. Also, petition of Jack Ingegnieros Democratic Association, No. 1, of New York City, urging adoption of the national lottery bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4187. Also, resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Jersey Chick Association, favoring House bill 5802; to the Committee on Agriculture.

4188. Also, resolutions adopted by the Institute of Rural Economics of the State of New Jersey, favoring support of the President in maintaining wage scales on relief projects slightly less than those prevailing in the community; to the Committee on Appropriations.

4189. Also, resolutions adopted by the Institute of Rural Economics of the State of New Jersey, favoring our National Government to adopt a more consistent policy directed toward the establishment of a prosperous agriculture in this country; to the Committee on Agriculture.

4190. By Mr. LAMNECK: Resolution of the Columbus Chamber of Commerce, Columbus, Ohio, protesting against the wage-schedule provision passed by the Senate under what is known as the "McCarran amendment"; to the Committee on Labor.

4191. By Mr. LESINSKI: Resolution of the Common Council of the City of Detroit, Mich., respectfully petitioning the President of the United States and Congress to authorize and appropriate sufficient moneys to build a Veterans' Administration hospital of 500-bed capacity in the Detroit area; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

4192. Also, resolution of members of the American Jugoslav Educational League, being directly or indirectly dependent upon copper mining for a living, petitioning the Congress of the United States to sustain the present excise tax on

copper and to increase same to 8 cents per pound or to put an embargo on all foreign copper; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

4193. Also, resolution of Calumet Business Men's Association, Calumet, Mich., petitioning, urging, and recommending the enactment of legislation to effectively prohibit the importation of any foreign-produced raw or refined copper; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

4194. Also, resolution of the executive board of the Slovenic-Croatian Union, a fraternal organization at Calumet, Mich., urging and recommending the enactment of legislation to prohibit the importation of any foreign-produced copper; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

4195. Also, resolution of International Workers' Order, Branch 2088, Detroit, Mich., urging the enactment of the workers' unemployment, old-age, and social-insurance act (H. R. 2827) in the interest of the toiling masses of the United States of America; to the Committee on Labor.

4196. Also, resolution of the Slovak Evangelical Union, No. 218, urging the enactment of the workers' unemployment, old-age, and social-insurance act (H. R. 2827); to the Committee on Labor.

4197. Also, resolution of the Evangelical Slovak Women's Union of Detroit, Mich., urging the enactment of the workers' unemployment, old-age, and social-insurance act (H. R. 2827); to the Committee on Labor.

4198. Also, resolution of the Michigan Federation of Labor, urging and favoring legislation and regulation limiting the length, weight, and speed of commercial vehicles using the public highways and also limiting the hours of service of the drivers of such vehicles so as to protect the safety of the general public; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

4199. By Mr. KRAMER: Resolution of the Los Angeles City Council, relative to the immediate establishment of a national civil academy, etc.; to the Committee on Education.

4200. Also, resolution of the Kiwanis Club of Englewood, relative to legislation on un-American activities, etc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4201. By Mr. MEAD: Petition of the Marine Workers Industrial Union, Waterfront Unemployed Council, American League of Ex-Servicemen, urging that Congress enact pending legislation to pay immediately the adjusted-compensation certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4202. By Mr. MERRITT of New York: Petition of Vernon B. Walters and 10 other citizens of New York, concerning the Rayburn-Wheeler public-utility holding companies bills (H. R. 5423 and S. 1725); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

4203. Also, petition of Kathryn Hinnenkamp and 10 other citizens of New York, concerning the Rayburn-Wheeler bills; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

4204. Also, petition of Thomas J. Coffey and sundry residents of New York City and Brooklyn, N. Y., urging Congress to defeat the Rayburn bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

4205. Also, petition of Warren B. Sheldon and sundry residents of Brooklyn and New York City, appealing to Congress to defeat the passage of the Rayburn bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

4206. Also, resolution of the World Trade League of the United States, Inc., New York City, N. Y., heartily supporting the efforts of the Government under the able direction of Secretary of State Hull and his collaborators to accord in reciprocal trade agreements, etc.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4207. Also, petition of the Holy Name Society of St. Matthias Roman Catholic Church, Ridgewood, Brooklyn, N. Y., concerning conditions in Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4208. By Mr. MILLARD: Resolution adopted by the Father Edward F. O'Sullivan Council, Knights of Columbus, Harrison, N. Y., protesting certain activities of the National Revolutionary Party in Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4209. Also, resolution adopted by the Architectural and Engineering Alliance, of White Plains, N. Y., urging the enactment of the so-called "Hayden highway amendment" to House Joint Resolution 117; to the Committee on Appropriations.

4210. By Mr. PFEIFER: Petition of Kings County Pattern & Model Works, Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring the passage of House bill 4027; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4211. Also, petition of the Kings and Queens Counties Roofers and Sheet Metal Contractors Association, Brooklyn, N. Y., concerning amendment to work relief bill whereby private contractors will be permitted to participate and bid on proposed projects; to the Committee on Appropriations.

4212. Also, Concurrent Resolution No. 89, Senate of the State of New York, Albany, urging the Secretary of the Interior appropriate funds for slum clearance and better housing in Greenwich Village and Chelsea sections of Manhattan, from Tenth to Sixty-third Streets, west of Seventh and Eighth Avenues; to the Committee on Appropriations.

4213. Also, petition of Piel Bros., Brooklyn, N. Y., urging defeat of Senate bill 626 and House bill 5851; to the Committee on Agriculture.

4214. Also, petition of the Merchants Association of New York, concerning the public utility bills of 1935 (S. 1725 and H. R. 5423); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

4215. Also, petition of the Bellis Wire Works, Inc., Brooklyn, N. Y., concerning House bill 4027; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4216. Also, petition of the East Brooklyn Savings & Loan Associations, Brooklyn, N. Y., concerning discrimination against State-chartered savings and loan associations; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

4217. By Mr. RABAUT: Resolution of the Detroit Fire Department Post, No. 1339, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, petitioning the President of the United States and Congress to authorize and appropriate sufficient moneys to build a Veterans' Administration hospital of 500-bed capacity in the Detroit area; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

4218. Also, Concurrent Resolution No. 6, Senate of the State of Michigan, memorializing the Congress of the United States to pass, and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, the General Pulaski's Memorial Day resolution now pending in Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4219. Also, Concurrent Resolution No. 5, Senate of the State of Michigan, memorializing the Congress of the United States to pass suitable legislation or the Postmaster General take suitable action to deed to the State of Michigan the old post-office site and building in Lansing, Mich.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

4220. Also, Resolution 13006, of the Common Council of the city of Dearborn, Mich., asking that October 11 of each year be set aside as General Pulaski's Memorial Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4221. Also, resolution of the United Racial Groups of America, favoring old-age pension laws be approved and made applicable to noncitizens as well as citizens, providing that such noncitizens be residents of the United States for not less than 10 years prior to the passage of such legislation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4222. By Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma: Petition of A. Tolman and numerous other citizens of Dallas, Tex., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4223. Also, petition of W. A. Norman and numerous other citizens of Brownwood, Tex., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4224. Also, petition of E. Craig and numerous other citizens of Baytown, Tex., favoring House bill 2856, by Con-

gressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4225. Also, petition of G. Smith and numerous other citizens of Center, Tex., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4226. Also, petition of Vernon Furlow and numerous other citizens of Alvord, Tex., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4227. Also, petition of G. C. Huffman and numerous other citizens of Lingleville, Tex., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4228. Also, petition of H. C. Subers and numerous other citizens of Eastland, Tex., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4229. Also, petition of L. Sikes and numerous other citizens of Huffman, Ark., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4230. Also, petition of A. Hollingsworth and numerous other citizens of Cooter, Mo., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4231. Also, petition of A. Bowens and numerous other citizens of Blytheville, Ark., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4232. Also, petition of M. Burnett and numerous other citizens of Hooks, Tex., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4233. Also, petition of John Norfleet and numerous other citizens of Fort Worth, Tex., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4234. Also, petition of John Roberts and numerous other citizens of New Boston, Tex., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4235. Also, petition of C. H. Webster and numerous other citizens of the county of McCurtain, in the State of Oklahoma, favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4236. Also, petition of J. W. Bearden and numerous other citizens of Wright City, Okla., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4237. Also, petition of B. L. McPhearson and numerous other citizens of Conway, Ark., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4238. Also, petition of W. J. Stone and numerous other citizens of Vilonia, Ark., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4239. Also, petition of C. J. Vaughn and numerous other citizens of Royston, Ga., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4240. Also, petition of G. S. Drake and numerous other citizens of Comer, Ga., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4241. Also, petition of O. L. Osley and numerous other citizens of Bowman, Ga., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4242. Also, petition of C. H. Frye and numerous other citizens of Pinnacle, N. C., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4243. Also, petition of G. B. Rockett and numerous other citizens of Winston-Salem, N. C., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4244. Also, petition of W. L. Dobbins and numerous other citizens of Yadkinville, N. C., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4245. Also, petition of C. R. Reeves and numerous other citizens of the county of Amite, in the State of Mississippi, favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4246. Also, petition of Lawrence Westbrook and numerous other citizens of Smithdale, Miss., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4247. Also, petition of C. A. Voyles, and numerous other citizens of Birch, N. C., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4248. Also, petition of J. A. Williamson and numerous other citizens of Persimmon Creek, N. C., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4249. Also, petition of L. H. Picklesimon and numerous other citizens of Suit, N. C., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4250. Also, petition of John W. Keenum and numerous other citizens of Vests, N. C., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4251. Also, petition of Andrew Gregory and numerous other citizens of Brinkley, Ark., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4252. Also, petition of Ambrose Wynne and numerous other citizens of Fargo, Ark., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4253. Also, petition of Sylvester Roach and numerous other citizens of the county of Mobile in the State of Alabama, favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4254. Also, petition of John Trotter and numerous other citizens of Mobile, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-

age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4255. Also, petition of L. D. McClonid and numerous other citizens of Magee, Miss., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4256. Also, petition of Frederick Jones and numerous other citizens of Weathersby, Miss., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4257. Also, petition of Washington Hays and numerous other citizens of Mendenhall, Miss., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4258. Also, petition of James Hayes and numerous other citizens of the county of East Feliciana in the State of Louisiana, favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4259. Also, petition of Alex Evans, Sr., and numerous other citizens of Slaughter, La., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4260. Also, petition of W. Hicks, and numerous other citizens of Dundee, Ky., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4261. Also, petition of J. H. Wilson and numerous other citizens of Hartford, Ky., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4262. Also, petition of R. Reed and numerous other citizens of the county of Covington in the State of Louisiana, favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4263. Also, petition of Andrew Pierrie and numerous other citizens of Falsom, La., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4264. Also, petition of W. D. Beaner and numerous other citizens of the county of Cherokee in the State of South Carolina, favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4265. Also, petition of R. J. Campbell and numerous other citizens of Gaffney, S. C., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4266. Also, petition of M. J. Freeman and numerous other citizens of Chattahoochee, Fla., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4267. Also, petition of Joseph Braxton and numerous other citizens of Tallahassee, Fla., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4268. Also, petition of M. D. Wade and numerous other citizens of Sneads, Fla., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4269. Also, petition of L. Glover and numerous other citizens of St. Joseph, Fla., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4270. Also, petition of Spencer Washington and numerous other citizens of Apalachicola, Fla., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4271. Also, petition of Lester Woods and numerous other citizens of the county of Jefferson in the State of Alabama, favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4272. Also, petition of Charles Hill and numerous other citizens of Bessemer, Ala., favoring House bill H. R. 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4273. Also, petition of W. A. Jeffres and numerous other citizens of the county of Union in the State of Alabama, favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4274. Also, petition of J. A. Lowery and numerous other citizens of El Dorado, Ark., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4275. Also, petition of Frank McFall and numerous other citizens of the county of Pearl River in the State of Mississippi, favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4276. Also, petition of C. S. Green and numerous other citizens of Millard, Miss., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4277. Also, petition of C. R. Allen and numerous other citizens of the county of Newton in the State of Georgia, favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4278. Also, petition of Raymond Shodix and numerous other citizens of Covington, Ga., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4279. Also, petition of G. McDaniel and numerous other citizens of the county of McCormick in the State of South Carolina, favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4280. Also, petition of the Rev. J. W. Elmore and numerous other citizens of Troy, S. C., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4281. Also, petition of D. Evans and numerous other citizens of the county of Grimes in the State of Texas, favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4282. Also, petition of Julius Paulhill and numerous other citizens of Singleton, Tex., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4283. Also, petition of Henry Floyd and numerous other citizens of the county of Crittenden in the State of Arkansas, favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4284. Also, petition of Percy Marsh and numerous other citizens of Earl, Ark., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age

pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4285. Also, petition of O. Alexander and numerous other citizens of Jacksonville, Tex., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4286. Also, petition of M. P. Bobbitt and numerous other citizens of Ponta, Tex., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4287. Also, petition of William Taylor and numerous other citizens of the county of Alexander in the State of Illinois, favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4288. Also, petition of Robert Griffin and numerous other citizens of Cairo, Ill., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pension of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4289. Also, petition of M. May and numerous other citizens of Oakley, Ky., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pension of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4290. Also, petition of B. B. Duncan and numerous other citizens of Madisonville, Ky., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4291. Also, petition of M. Y. Swope and numerous other citizens of Maniton, Ky., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4292. Also, petition of Gus Wiship and numerous other citizens of Dunnellon, Fla., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4293. Also, petition of Henry Ivory and numerous other citizens of the county of Brundidge in the State of Alabama, favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4294. Also, petition of Calvin Jones and numerous other citizens of Brundidge, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4295. Also, petition of E. D. Green and numerous other citizens of Enterprise, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4296. Also, petition of Voltaire Baptiste and numerous other citizens of the county of Iberville in the State of Louisiana, favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4297. Also, petition of Isac Baptiste and numerous other citizens of White Castle, La., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4298. Also, petition of A. Gibbs and other citizens of Goldonna, La., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4299. Also, petition of F. M. Walker and numerous other citizens of Dry Prong, La., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4300. Also, petition of V. O. Roberts and numerous other citizens of the county of Roosevelt, in the State of New Mexico, favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4301. Also, petition of I. O. Harris and numerous other citizens of Portales, N. Mex., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4302. Also, petition of A. G. Ammons and numerous other citizens of Prescott, Ark., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4303. Also, petition of H. J. Tompkins and numerous other citizens of Waldo, Ark., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4304. Also, petition of A. Z. Shipp and numerous other citizens of Rosston, Ark., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4305. Also, petition of J. S. Benson and numerous other citizens of Oakland, Miss., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4306. Also, petition of Merret M. Phillips and numerous other citizens of Montgomery, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4307. Also, petition of Charley Calcote and numerous other citizens of Hamburg, Miss., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4308. Also, petition of Monroe Johnson and numerous other citizens of Leesdale, Miss., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4309. Also, petition of Jeff McGill and numerous other citizens of the county of Marion in the State of Florida, favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4310. Also, petition of A. G. Fleming and numerous other citizens of the county of Coffee in the State of Alabama, favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4311. Also, petition of Anderson Tellie and numerous other citizens of the county of Yalobusha in the State of Mississippi, favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4312. Also, petition of R. S. Canterbury and numerous other citizens of the county of Montgomery in the State of Alabama, favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 to $50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4313. By Mr. SHANLEY: Petition of Rolfe E. Rowe, town clerk, Bristol, Conn.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4314. By Mr. SMITH of Connecticut: Resolution adopted by the City Council of Bristol, Conn., memorializing Congress to proclaim October 11, General Pulaski's Memorial Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4315. By Mr. TRUAX: Petition of Edith Obetz and other citizens of Columbus, Ohio, stating that they will be seri-

ously harmed if either of the public-utility bills introduced in Congress February 6, 1935, becomes a law, as these bills are unfair, unwise, unnecessary, and discriminatory; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

4316. Also, petition of F. E. Bussdieker and other citizens of Toledo, Ohio, urging Congress to pass the Townsend old-age revolving pension plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4317. Also, petition of J. C. Sloan and other citizens of Toledo, Ohio, urging the Government of the United States to pass a bill obligating itself to pay every citizen of said Government, whose record is free of habitual criminality and who has attained the age of 60 years, a monthly pension of $200 until the end of his life upon the sole condition that he agree, under oath, to spend the entire amount of the pension within the confines of the United States during the current month in which it is received; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4318. Also, petition of Gertrude S. Cook and other citizens of Columbus, Ohio, stating that they will be seriously harmed if either of the public-utility bills introduced in Congress February 6, 1935, becomes a law, as these bills are unfair, unwise, unnecessary, and discriminatory; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

4319. Also, petition of the Newburg Branch of the Townsend Old-Age Pensions Organization, by their president, James H. Rose, and secretary, Hugh E. Smith, Cleveland, Ohio, urging Congressman TRUAX to sign the petition to bring the McGroarty bill out of committee; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4320. By Mr. WHITE: Memorial of the Idaho State Legislature, urging the Congress of the United States to give early and favorable consideration to such legislation as will bring about the full and immediate payment of the adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4321. By Mr. WIGGLESWORTH: Petition of City Council of Brockton, Mass., urging Congress to enact legislation that will permit of the paying of workingmen's compensation to any person suffering injuries or death while working on Emergency Relief Administration projects; to the Committee on Appropriations.

4322. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Roosevelt League of the city of Cleveland, Ohio; to the Committee on Labor.

4323. Also, petition of the city of Gillespie, Ill.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4324. Also, petition of the village of Roseville, Mich.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4325. Also, petition of the city of Akron, Ohio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4326. Also, petition of La Jolla Townsend Club, La Jolla, Calif.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4327. Also, petition of the Golden Hill Townsend Club No. 53, San Diego, Calif.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4328. Also, petition of the Five Point Branch, Unemployment Council, Denver, Colo.; to the Committee on Labor.

4329. Also, petition of the Merchant Tailors Society, of the city of New York; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

4330. Also, petition of the code administrative agency of western Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Labor.

4331. Also, petition of the Idaho State Association of Bank Depositors; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

4332. By Mr. ANDREWS of New York: Petition containing 40 names protesting against enactment of the holding-company bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

4333. By Mr. ANDREW of Massachusetts: Petition signed by W. J. Donais and 92 other residents of Merrimac, Mass., and vinicity, favoring the Townsend plan for old-age pensions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4334. By Mr. WITHROW: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, urging Congress to enact tariffs to protect the agricultural industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4335. By Mr. WOLCOTT: Petition of Mabel Evans of Akron, Mich., and 27 other resident of Tuscola County, Mich., urging the prompt enactment of the Frazier-Lemke refinancing bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

4336. By Mr. BERLIN: Petition of Groups Nos. 124 and 65, of the Polish National Alliance of the United States of North America, with local headquarters at East Vandergrift and New Kensington, Pa., respectively, that House Joint Resolution No. 81 or Senate Joint Resolution No. 11, directing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day, be enacted; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4337. Also a petition of the Council of the City of Monessen, Pa., urging that the Congress of the United States pass, and the President of the United States approve, if passed, the General Pulaski's Memorial Day resolution now pending; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

TUESDAY, MARCH 19, 1935

(Legislative day of Wednesday, Mar. 13, 1935)

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

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. ROBINSON, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Monday, March 18, 1935, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 5322) authorizing the President of the United States to present in the name of Congress a medal of honor to Maj. Gen. Adolphus Washington Greely, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

REPORT OF AMERICAN WAR MOTHERS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a report, submitted pursuant to law, of the American War Mothers for the year ended October 1, 1934, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following resolution of the Senate of Puerto Rico, which was referred to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs:

I, Enrique Gonzalez Mena, secretary of the Senate of Puerto Rico, do hereby certify that the following resolution was unanimously approved by the Senate of Puerto Rico on March 11, 1935:

"Resolution to request His Excellency the President of the United States, the Honorable Franklin Delano Roosevelt; the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States; the Chairman of the Committee on Territories and Insular Possessions of the Senate of the United States; the Chairman of the Committee on Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives of the United States; the Secretary of the Interior, the Honorable Harold L. Ickes, and the Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico in Washington, the Honorable Santiago Iglesias, that approval be given to the legislation introduced in the Congress of the United States amending the organic act of Puerto Rico in the sense that the municipal bond issues to carry out self-liquidating projects be not charged against the borrowing capacity of the municipalities, and for other purposes

"Whereas a bill has been introduced in the Congress of the United States, providing an amendment to the effect that the bond issues of the municipalities of Puerto Rico to carry out self-liquidating projects be not charged against their borrowing capacity;

"Whereas such legislative measure, if definitely approved, would redound to the great benefit of the municipalities of Puerto Rico and would be of great use in improving the economic conditions thereof: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of Puerto Rico*, First: To request from His Excellency the President of the United States, the Honorable Franklin Delano Roosevelt; the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States; the Chairman of the Committee on Territories and Insular Possessions of the Senate of the United States; the Chairman of the Committee on Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives of the United States; the Secretary of the Interior, the Honorable Harold L. Ickes, and the Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico in Washington, the Honorable Santiago Iglesias, the approval of the legislation introduced in the Congress of the United States amending